

and property of Indians by the Secretary of the Interior; for the transfer of title to Indian lands to the States; for the final and full citizenship of Indians; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8122. A bill to repeal the act providing for a national census of housing; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 8123. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H. R. 8124. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahanomen, Itasca, Pine, St. Louis, Clearwater, Koochiching, and Becker Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 8125. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 8126. A bill to establish a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8127. A bill to compensate certain native Puerto Ricans for services rendered in the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 8128. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to Public Resolution No. 24 of the Seventy-sixth Congress making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, by providing a prevailing rate of wage; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McKEOUGH:

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1940, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. Res. 367. Resolution to investigate the qualifications, compensation, and methods of preferment of all attorneys and other legal personnel employed by the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 8129. A bill for the relief of the St. Nicholas Park Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 8130. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Frazee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 8131. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eiva Midkiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 8132. A bill for the relief of T. L. Roark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 8133. A bill for the relief of William A. Wheeler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 8134. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sophia M. Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 8135. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 8136. A bill for the relief of Nina M. Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 8137. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 8138. A bill granting a pension to Eva H. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 8139. A bill granting a pension to Joe McMurry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 8140. A bill for the relief of Stanley McMahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 8141. A bill for the relief of Ralph Y. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 8142. A bill for the relief of Edwin Charles Bock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 8143. A bill for the relief of Kirel Doroszko; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 8144. A bill granting a pension to Howell P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8145. A bill for the relief of A. M. Garmon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 8146. A bill for the relief of John I. Twehues; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 8147. A bill for the relief of Emery C. Pickett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVY:

H. J. Res. 441. Joint resolution for the relief of North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 23, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast taught us through the wisdom of life to rejoice in the breath of the morning, in the fresh radiance of flowers, in the dreaming mountains surplined now in their robes of white: Accept our heartfelt thanks for these unseen powers, whose presence we can feel, as they weave God's garments out of the loveliness of earth and sea and sky, causing us to exclaim, "Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory."

Grant us by faith a vision of the Tree of Life, in whose branches the breath of all the centuries is but a little whisper of the winds, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, and whose immortal fruit shall preserve our souls beyond the reach of time and chance and death. Help us to face our world fearless and undismayed because of hope which, even in the darkest night, looks up with confidence to the shining stars, and love, which constrains us to regard our fellow men with the invincible loyalty of Him whose great heart never faltered even though they crucified His love, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ADAMS. In the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, January 23, 1940, be dispensed with and that the Journal be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 5118) for the relief of the State of Ohio, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

*Resolved*, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 419) to extend, for 3 additional months, the time during which articles imported free of duty for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition or the New York World's Fair, may be sold or abandoned, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	Holt	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bailey	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Slattery
Bankhead	Frazier	King	Smathers
Barbour	George	Lucas	Smith
Bilbo	Gerry	Lundeen	Stewart
Bridges	Gibson	McKellar	Taft
Brown	Gillette	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Glass	Maloney	Tobey
Byrd	Green	Mead	Townsend
Byrnes	Guffey	Miller	Truman
Capper	Gurney	Neely	Tydings
Chandler	Hale	Norris	Van Nuys
Chavez	Harrison	Pepper	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Hatch	Reed	Walsh
Connally	Hayden	Reynolds	Wheeler
Danaher	Herring	Russell	Wiley
Davis	Holman	Schwartz	

Mr. ADAMS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent in attendance upon a conference at the White House.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are members of the committee appointed to attend the funeral in Idaho of the late Senator Borah, and are, therefore, absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on official business for the Special Committee on Civil Liberties.

Mr. CONNALLY. I announce the absence of my colleague the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] because of illness. I should like to have the announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## THE LATE SENATOR BORAH

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, as the mortal remains of the late Senator BORAH are being laid to rest today I wish briefly to speak of the lasting values of his life that will never die.

Senator BORAH had a peace of mind which goes with a great liberty. Few have it. He had it because he cultivated it and thought more of his independence than of all else. When he spoke for America it was because he had in his

heart a deep, abiding love for this country. The threads of his diversified thought fit into a matchless pattern of devotion to duty in behalf of his native land. In his judgment, nothing was ever too good to be true in America; and he dedicated his life to keeping the Nation safe and secure within the moorings of the Constitution.

In this time of national thought on the superb leadership of Senator BORAH our eyes have filled with tears, and our hearts have glowed with tenderness; for he seemed very close to us. He seemed close to millions of people for whom he was a mighty voice and a fearless champion. We miss him. Our tears are not for him, but for ourselves. We have a sense of loneliness because he cannot be replaced. Yet we are comforted because there are so many of us who share the united thought that here was and is our friend—one whose stalwart spirit will continue to bless and defend us. He was indeed the tribune of the people.

Senator BORAH was free because he listened to the growing and changing trends of public opinion. His voice was elastic and his point of view flexible to accord with the rise and fall of popular needs. Never, however, did he depart from his fidelity to the fundamental precepts of American traditions and principles as he understood them; and no one understood them better than he.

Our friend loved the out-of-doors. Often he roamed through Rock Creek Park. To the Nation he has been as a mighty oak tree, or a lordly cedar, which, going down "with a great shout upon the hills, leaves a lonesome place against the sky." And yet his life reminds me of these words by Ella Higginson:

I know a place where the sun is like gold,  
And the cherry blossoms burst with snow,  
And down underneath is the loveliest nook,  
Where the four-leaf clovers grow.

One leaf is for hope, and one is for faith,  
And one is for love, you know;  
And God put another in for luck,  
If you search, you will find where they grow.

But you must have hope, and you must have faith,  
You must love and be strong—and so,  
If you work, if you wait, you will find the place  
Where the four-leaf clovers grow.

## NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON THE LOUISIANA DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate today with respect to the Democratic primary held in my State on January 16, but because, due to the inclement weather we are having, I was unable to obtain certain data for which I asked, I give notice that I shall address the Senate after the morning hour on the next legislative day, which will probably be Monday.

## BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement. The statute imposes upon the chairman of the Committee on Commerce the duty of appointing each year two members of that committee to the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. I desire therefore to announce the appointment for the present year of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I wish the RECORD to show that appointment.

## PRESENTATION OF BIRTHDAY CAKE TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of paying a brief tribute to three young ladies of my State. On yesterday Misses Elinor Myrup, Marilou Winter, and Elsie Schmidt, of Chicago, came to the city of Washington by airplane for the purpose of presenting to President Roosevelt a huge birthday cake in commemoration of the fifty-eighth anniversary of his birth. These three young ladies are daughters of the three leading officials of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union.

The cake was donated to the labor division of the committee for the celebration of the President's birthday by the bakery union as a means of raising additional funds for the "fight infantile paralysis" campaign. American Federation



of Labor unions bought the 58 candles on the cake, which grossed more than \$5,800 for the paralysis fund.

The labor division, of which William Green is chairman, and Chester M. Wright, director of organization, distributed nearly three and one-half million President's birthday greeting cards to members of organized labor throughout the Nation and its territories, and asked each member receiving a card to return it to the White House loaded with dimes and dollars for the war on the dreaded scourge.

I commend the American Federation of Labor for their unusual interest in a humanitarian program that is valiantly fighting this dread disease.

#### REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on InterOceanic Canals:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1940.

#### REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on InterOceanic Canals:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninetieth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1940.

#### CIVIL SERVICE TENURE FOR ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of title 43 of the United States Code, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### REPORT OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-third annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the National Farm Loan Associations of Alice, Brownwood, and George West, all in the State of Texas, favoring the enactment of legislation to restore the Farm Credit Administration to the status of an independent bureau, and placing the operations of the Federal land banks, national farm-loan associations, and other units of the Administration under the supervision of a bipartisan board appointed by the President for fixed terms, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, which were referred to the Select Committee on Government Organization.

Mr. CAPPER presented a letter in the nature of a petition signed by the secretary and other members of the Junior Mothers' Club, of Chanute, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 517, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### PROHIBITION OF TRANSFER OF AMERICAN VESSELS TO FOREIGN REGISTRY OR PERSONS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram addressed to me by the National Council of the National Maritime Union with regard to Senate bill 3075,

which I have introduced, providing for the repeal of the power of the Maritime Commission to grant transfers of ships to foreign registry.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram, which is very brief, be inserted at this point in my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 16, 1940.

Senator CLARK of Missouri,

Senate Office Building:

National Council, National Maritime Union, representing 65,000 organized seamen, at present in session in New York City, has gone on record unanimously to support your position against sale or transfer of American ships to foreign countries. Sale or transfer at this time is nothing more or less than a step toward involving the United States into war. National Maritime Union offers all its facilities to aid in passage of this bill in Congress.

JOSEPH CURRAN, President.

#### LOWER INTEREST RATES AND MORATORIA ON FARM MORTGAGES—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the necessity of lower interest rates on farm mortgages; also to the fact that the continuance of droughts and low farm prices have made it impossible for many farmers to meet their mortgage payments as they come due.

I am not now speaking of the farmers who, through their own fault, have failed to make sufficient income to meet these payments. I refer to the great number of good, thrifty, intelligent, industrious farmers who, through no fault of their own, but because of weather and unfavorable economic conditions are delinquent.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact, as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, that the purchasing power of the farmers at the close of 1939 was only 79 percent of what it was in 1910-14, when farm income and factory income were in fairly equitable balance. Secretary Wallace says that farm income nationally is approximately \$2,000,000,000 less than it should be if parity of agriculture and industry is to be attained.

Mr. President, the 7,000,000 farm families in the United States constitute one-fourth of the entire population. They receive from one-eleventh to one-tenth of the national income. On that income—admittedly about \$2,000,000,000 below parity income—they are expected to pay taxes, mortgage indebtedness, operating costs of their business, living costs of their families and, in addition, educate one-third of the boys and girls of school age in the entire country.

I am receiving many resolutions adopted by county farm-loan associations in Kansas at their annual meetings, which are held at this time of year. These are the local associations which handle farm mortgages taken through the Federal land-bank system under the Farm Credit Administration. They are stockholders as well as borrowers in that system. The burden of these resolutions is that interest rates should be lowered, and that more lenient foreclosure policies should be adopted through this farm financial crisis. Most of them urge that interest rates on Federal land-bank loans be reduced to 3 percent, and that on land bank commissioner loans, which are distress loans, the rate be not higher than 4 percent. There is now in effect an act which expires next June 30, fixing land-bank-loan interest rates at 3½ percent, and land bank commissioner loans at 4 percent.

I have pending in the Committee on Banking and Currency a bill which would fix these interest rates at 3 percent for 3 years after next June 30. It also would grant a moratorium on principal payments on these loans until July 1, 1943, if the borrower is not in default with respect to any other covenant or condition of his mortgage.

I say that under depressing conditions such as now exist, for which the farmers themselves are not responsible, the farmers are entitled to such a moratorium on principal payments and to 3 percent interest rates on their mortgages held by Government agencies. I earnestly request early action by the Committee on Banking and Currency on this matter.

I send to the desk copies of resolutions from the county farm loan associations of Doniphan, Osborne, Marshall

(Eldorado), Butler, and Barber Counties, and from the Kimeo National Farm Loan Association of Greenleaf, all in the State of Kansas, urging such action, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the resolutions presented by Mr. CAPPER which were adopted by the national farm loan associations at Eldorado, Greenleaf, Marysville, Medicine Lodge, Osborne, and Troy, in the State of Kansas, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a reduced interest rate on farm loans made by the Federal land bank and land bank commissioner, were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### CHARTERING OF FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Hon. R. F. Starley, of Salt Lake City, Utah, who is banking commissioner of that State, transmitting copy of a resolution adopted at the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, held at Salt Lake City, Utah, September 22, 1939. The resolution is in opposition to the further chartering of Federal savings and loan associations. I ask that the resolution itself be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted at the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Salt Lake City, Utah, September 22, 1939

Whereas this association recognizes that the existence of 30,000 or more banking institutions in this country was neither necessary to carry on the business of this country nor conducive to sound banking; and

Whereas the membership of this association, consisting of the commissioners of banking of the several States, in conjunction and in cooperation with the Comptroller's office, have worked diligently and faithfully to bring the number of banking institutions to such number as will meet the necessary needs and requirements for carrying on the business of the country; and

Whereas through such efforts and cooperation a system of banking has been established which we believe does meet all such necessary needs and requirements and gives to the country a much stronger and sounder system than heretofore existed; and

Whereas there is now established and being expanded a system of financial institutions under the name of Federal savings and loan associations that are doing, and propose to continue to do, business in active competition with banks; and

Whereas the chartering and supervision of these institutions is the responsibility of an agency other than those established to charter and supervise regularly chartered institutions constituted to carry on a banking business; and

Whereas such institutions are now seeking additional powers through acts of Congress which would expand the scope of such associations' activities; and

Whereas Federal savings and loan associations in some instances have been established without due regard to the already established banking facilities in communities throughout the country and without due regard to the necessity therefor; and

Whereas such practices are materially injurious to the already regularly established banking institutions in many, if not all, of the communities in which these Federal savings and loan associations are being placed; and

Whereas it is the sincere belief of this association that it is the ultimate intent and purpose in establishing these Federal savings and loan associations and increasing their powers that they shall in the end become mutual savings banks; and

Whereas, if this occurs, we will have the return of the same overbanked situation that existed in 1933 and prior thereto, with the resulting effects to the entire banking structure experienced in this country in recent years; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the membership of this association that the establishment of this system of Federal savings and loan associations should not only be curtailed but that their authority and activities should be reduced; and

Whereas it is the sense of this association that the word "savings" included in the name of these associations should never have been in the act authorizing their creation and should be stricken therefrom, because it is misleading, misinterpreted, and contrary to the very language of the act itself, wherein the act states "No deposits shall be accepted"; and

Whereas advertisements for such deposits are being made, in some instances at least, and unless restrictions are finally placed upon the activities of these Federal savings and loan associations, they will become a great hazard to the maintenance of a sound and safe banking system in this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association does hereby reiterate its opposition to the further chartering of Federal savings and loan associations and the granting of further power to the Federal Home Loan

Bank Board in the granting of charters and the establishment of these associations throughout the country; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby register our protest and opposition to bills providing for such expansion as introduced in the last Congress, and to any similar bills that may be introduced into the coming Congress to accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly ask the coming Congress not only to defeat such legislation, but to repeal the law authorizing the chartering of more of these institutions, or at least to modify the law so as to curtail their engaging in a banking business, and to place Federal savings and loan associations already established under the supervision and control of one of the recognized Federal bank supervising and examining authorities; and be it further

Resolved, That the contents of this resolution be by each member of this association brought to the attention of his State's delegation in Congress and that such information be given such delegation without delay.

#### AID TO FINLAND—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BROWN. I report back favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, the bill (S. 3069) to provide for certain loans to the Republic of Finland by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and I submit a report (No. 1166) thereon. The measure proposes to increase the authority of the Export-Import Bank to make loans and covers in general the Finnish loan question. Under the previous order and agreement entered into by the Senate, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under an order heretofore entered, the report will be received and the bill and report will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On January 19, 1940:

S. 1554. An act to provide that the district judge for the western district of Washington, authorized to be appointed under the act of May 31, 1938, shall be a district judge for the eastern and western districts of Washington.

On January 23, 1940:

S. 1335. An act relating to the filing of affidavits of prejudice in the District Court for the District of Alaska; and

S. 1919. An act to provide for the acquisition by the United States of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 3184. A bill for the relief of the Shaver Forwarding Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3185. A bill for the relief of Noland Blass; and  
S. 3186. A bill for the relief of Robert S. Boyd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 3187. A bill for the relief of Lucille Sleet (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3188. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Keffer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3189. A bill for the relief of Ola B. Auten and Harry Auten; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3190. A bill for the relief of Mary Stella Six; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3191. A bill to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 3192. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cliff Snider; to the Committee on Claims.



S. 3193. A bill authorizing the payment of an indemnity to the Spanish Government on account of the death of Juan Neira, a Spanish subject, killed at Savannah, Ga., by a United States truck; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 3194. A bill for the relief of Walter T. Blackwelder;

S. 3195. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department (with accompanying papers); and

S. 3196. A bill to amend the act approved May 24, 1938, entitled "An act for the relief of The Comision Mixta Demarcadora de Limites Entre Colombia y Panama" and for the relief of Jose Antonio Sossa D (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3197. A bill granting a pension to Anne Justice Greene; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3198. A bill to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army;

S. 3199. A bill to provide allowances for inactive-status training for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army; and

S. 3200. A bill to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army in the military departments of Panama and Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. REYNOLDS also introduced Senate bill 3201, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KING:

S. 3202. A bill to make it a crime to wreck or attempt to wreck a train engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3203. A bill to amend section 1262 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3204. A bill for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 3205. A bill prohibiting the use of appropriations for the payment of subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to certain persons; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 3206. A bill for the relief of the alien James Neohoritis; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS) introduced Senate bill 3207, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BULOW (for himself and Mr. GURNEY):

S. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution for the relief of South Dakota Wheat Growers Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

#### SUGAR QUOTA FOR MAINLAND CANE AREA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill on behalf of my colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] and myself proposing a more equitable sugar quota. I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and also that a statement relative thereto be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3207) to provide for a more equitable sugar quota for the mainland cane area, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### JOINT STATEMENT OF SENATORS PEPPER AND ANDREWS

The purpose of the bill introduced by Senator PEPPER and Senator ANDREWS is to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, to give to the mainland producer of sugar who has maintained the highest seasonal wage standard and the lowest cost of production, as determined by data made available to the secretary of such producers, the additional quota as produced by the deficit between that authorized under the Sugar Act of 1937 and the Philippine Independence Act.

This quota is provided for in the deficit arising from the difference of the 1940 quota of duty-free sugar from the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, which is 1,036,356 short tons, and under

the Philippine Independence Act the Philippine quota thus established is 981,912 tons, producing a deficit of 54,444 short tons.

Previously it has been the practice of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State to allocate this quota to foreign countries in direct discrimination against domestic areas.

This amendment does not authorize the Secretary to pay benefit payments on sugar allotted from the so-called Philippine deficit. It does require the Secretary to increase the producers marketing allotment so he can sell the sugar so allotted, but he receives no benefit payments.

The only cost to the Government would be the loss of duty. This loss would be offset many times by the increased employment provided in the continental producing area and increase consumption of surplus agricultural products. For thus to produce this amount of sugar, 54,444 short tons, direct employment would be provided for 5,500 men (basis of 1 man for every 10 tons) at the highest wages paid on agricultural work in the United States. Experts estimate that for every man directly employed, two other persons are subsequently employed in servicing them with food, clothing, housing, transportation, and other facilities, which are a part of the American standard of living.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF MARINE SCHOOLS, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 594) to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of Marine Schools, and for other purposes," approved March 11, 1911; to expand the public educational facilities of the several States and provide each with a State nautical academy; to create a new public-school system for education of masses of American youths in nautical, aviation, and technical fields relating thereto; to increase the national defense in the realm of radio; to improve navigation; to provide marine conservation and development; to create the United States Maritime Corps as a supplement to the Naval Reserves; to provide an abundant supply of native Americans, trained personnel to operate the new United States ships afloat and in the air; to provide the technical machinery for further maritime improvement; and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BORAH BY "THE STATE," OF COLUMBIA, S. C.

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Senator Borah, published in The State, of Columbia, S. C., of the issue of January 22, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BORAH BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late Senator Borah by Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REGULATION OF THE OVER-THE-COUNTER SECURITY MARKETS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Regulation of the Over-the-Counter Security Markets, delivered by him at San Francisco, Calif., August 22, 1939, at a meeting of the California Security Dealers Association, the Investment Bankers Association, and the National Association of Securities Dealers, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON NONPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICY

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator Taft at Milwaukee, Wis., on January 19, 1940, on the subject Nonpartisanship in Foreign and Domestic Policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### IRRIGATION OF GREAT PLAINS REGION

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between Senator HAYDEN and the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the irrigation of part of the Great Plains region, and a memorandum on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESSES BY GOVERNOR STASSEN AND PERRY PIPKIN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered at St. Paul, Minn., by Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, and Perry Pipkin, which appear in the Appendix.]

## INVESTIGATION OF LIFE INSURANCE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Luke J. Cavanaugh, Commissioner of Insurance of Colorado, relating to the investigation of life insurance, which appears in the Appendix.]

## CONDITIONS IN SPAIN

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the magazine Spain, written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, entitled "Victorious Spain," which appears in the Appendix.]

## FIRST PLANE FLIGHT

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The First Plane Flight," written by Hon. Carl Goerch and published in the State Magazine of Raleigh, N. C.]

## SILVER PURCHASE PROGRAM, ETC.

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of January 23, 1940, entitled "The Silver Folly," and an editorial from the Washington Post of January 22, 1940, entitled "The New Yellow Peril," which appear in the Appendix.]

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the following Senators be assigned to committee service, as indicated: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] to the Committee on the Judiciary; the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the Committee on Civil Service; the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] to the Committee on Military Affairs; and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] to the chairmanship of the Committee on Claims.

## DELEGATION OF CERTAIN REGULATORY FUNCTIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1955) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to delegate certain regulatory functions and to create the position of Second Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WHEELER, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. SCHWELLENBACH, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

## THE RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in Asia, as well as in Europe, tragic conditions exist. Japan is reviving the worst forms of oriental tyranny and of medieval barbarism. She is attacking defenseless cities and towns and spreading ruin and devastation over a vast area in China. No more brutal and barbarous course has been pursued in modern times under the guise of war. Japan is carrying on a plan of extermination. Millions of people have been driven from their homes, hundreds, if not thousands, of towns and cities have been destroyed, important commercial centers have been wrecked by bombs from the air, and millions of people, without shelter or food, have been forced to flee, without any possibility of succor or support.

Hitler carried on a war of devastation in Poland. He has vouchsafed no justification for the cruel and merciless course which he and the Nazis pursued. Important cities were destroyed, millions of people driven from their homes, and a flourishing and progressive nation brought under subjection to Nazi and Bolshevik rule. When the chapter is written of the merciless and barbarous policies pursued by Hitler and Stalin in Poland, those who peruse its pages will be compelled to regard Hitler and Stalin as among the most cruel and merciless despots who afflicted the world.

It is apparent that Hitler and Stalin seek the destruction of democratic nations. Democracy is alien to their philosophy, and they seek to impose upon peace-loving democratic peoples, not only an alien rule, but one which finds no parallel, except in dark ages or in periods when cruel Oriental monsters carried on wars of rapine and plunder. Not only are the rights of minorities being attacked by Japan, by the Bolsheviks and the Nazis, but liberal and progressive governments, in which peace and progress were enjoyed by millions of people, are being assailed by Hitler and Stalin. The pages of history are being blurred with records of oppression and cruelty and attempts to destroy not only minorities and the rights and dignity of human beings, but of independent and progressive democracies. Nineteen hundred and thirty-nine witnessed the dismemberment of nations and the destruction of important small peoples. If the sweep of brute force is not halted, this year may bring the complete disappearance of many small nations from the face of the earth. With each blow struck against small nations, such as Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and against larger nations, such as Poland, it becomes apparent that the rights of all peoples have been attacked, and the principles of liberty and justice assailed. A world that is not safe for minorities and for small nations is a world that is not safe for democracy. When Austria was destroyed, when Czechoslovakia was mutilated, when Poland was crucified by bolshevism and nazi-ism, the concepts of right and wrong, of liberty and justice, were shaken. In the midst of this confusion, the aggressor nations laid down a barrage of words, designed to cloak brutal conquest in the robes of liberation.

The inhuman and barbarous attack upon Finland is part of an organized attempt at the assassination of the character and integrity of all minorities and of all small nations. The whole concept of self-determination for small groups and small nations is being completely undermined. This is a process with profound implications for all countries and all peoples. The way to the destruction of the rights of majorities begins in the footpath of the annihilation of minorities. The rights of majorities are guaranteed only when the rights of minorities and small nations remain inviolate.

The democratic and liberty-loving peoples of Europe are being menaced by the Nazi and Bolshevik governments. The destruction of Finland may not appease the rapacity of the Bolshevik regime, and the Scandinavian states, which have made important contributions to the highest form of civilization, may be the next objects of assault by Hitler and Stalin. There are indications that the Soviet Government plans the destruction of some of the Balkan states, and in far-off Asia, millions of people are concerned as to their future in the face of Bolshevik activities. Switzerland, Belgium, Holland—countries in which liberty is enjoyed—may not escape the ambitions of the Nazi regime.

Mr. President, the Bolshevik Government has never concealed its purpose, to spread its authority throughout the world. It seeks the destruction of all democratic nations and the reign of communism throughout the world. I believed that it would be a mistake for our Government to recognize the Bolshevik regime. I believed, from statements made to me by Bolshevik leaders and by the conduct of the Bolshevik Government, that it would seize every opportunity to introduce the baneful philosophy of communism into the United States, and to undermine democratic institutions.

Accordingly, when it was suggested in 1933 that the Bolshevik regime be recognized, I indicated my opposition to that policy, and took the liberty of submitting a memorandum to the Executive Department, in which I expressed, in part at least, the ground of my opposition to the recognition of the Soviet Government. I had been in Russia a number of years before, and traveled many thousand miles, and had visited nearly all sections of European Russia. I met many of the Bolshevik leaders, and learned from them and from ardent Communists their purposes and the activities which they sought. They did not hesitate to declare that communism was a world cult, and must be superimposed upon the peoples of the world. While I had great sympathy for the mass of the Russian people, I deeply regretted their blind obedience to



Bolshevik leaders, and sympathized with them because of the oppressive and despotic rule to which they were subjected.

In view of all the facts brought to my attention, I believed it would be unwise for our Government to recognize the Bolshevik regime; and therefore, I prepared a memorandum and submitted it to the Executive Department on the 13th of November 1933, in which I set forth, in part at least, my views in regard to the proposed recognition of the Stalin Government.

The memorandum is as follows:

No circumstances have arisen to date that would alter my attitude, heretofore expressed in the Senate and elsewhere, on the question of recognition by the United States of the Soviet Government of Russia.

I have always felt the most profound sympathy for the Russian people and have entertained keen regret that they should be subjected to a regime of political and economic dictatorship represented by the present authority in Russia. I have believed that as an American I have no right to interfere with the internal or economic affairs established and maintained by another sovereign nation.

On the other hand, I have always contended that recognition of a foreign government by our Government is not a duty nor an obligation on our part but an act of policy dictated by considerations which appear to be in our best interest.

I supported the position of President Wilson in refusing to recognize the Bolshevik regime; and after having visited Russia, where I spent several months and traveled more than 8,000 miles, I was more firmly convinced that the best interests of our country would not be served by extending recognition to the Soviet Government until and unless that Government should change its policy with respect to internal affairs as well as external matters, and, moreover, that it should give ample and convincing proof of its intention to assume in its international relations a clear obligation to act in accordance with the generally recognized standards of friendly intercourse among nations. I am therefore opposed to extending recognition to the Soviet Government until such proof is forthcoming.

If it should become the policy of our Government to reconsider at this time our official attitude toward the Soviet Government, our first step should be the creation of a competent commission to ascertain, both independently and in consultation with the representatives of the Soviet Government, the necessary facts upon which a judgment can be based as to whether or not the Soviet Government is prepared, in fact, to assume international obligations common to all civilized nations. Specifically, before extending recognition to the Soviet Government, we should know:

(a) Whether or not that Government is prepared to undertake to conduct no subversive propaganda in our country or our territorial possessions, either directly through its accredited representatives or indirectly through such an agency as the Third International.

May I interpolate here that I emphasized that point in my memorandum because of conversations which I had with Bolshevik leaders when in Russia, in which they indicated that recognition would afford opportunities for the dissemination of the principles of the communist faith.

The second point I suggested was:

Whether or not that Government is prepared to and will disassociate itself from the Third International and will agree to no longer subsidize it or contribute to its maintenance or activities.

May I add in passing that when in Moscow I visited the Third International headquarters? There I saw Mr. Radek, who was, in the absence of Zinoviev, in control of the headquarters. Sitting with him was Bill Haywood, who, as Senators will recall, was prosecuted for transgressions of law during the World War, and convicted. He fled to Russia, forfeiting his bail of \$50,000. When I saw him in the Third International headquarters he greeted me and stated that the United States "didn't get" him. He was frank in indicating that, as a member of the Third International, he was using his best efforts to spread communism in the United States and in other countries. I might add in passing that he remained in Russia until the time of his death, which was several years after I saw him in 1924.

I might add, for the benefit of my colleagues from the South, that sitting with Mr. Radek was also a colored man from Alabama, who frankly stated that he was a Communist and was a member of the Third International, and was engaged in the spread of communism among his race in the United States.

The memorandum continues:

(c) Whether or not that Government is prepared to and will guarantee an open public and fair trial to any American citizen who may

be charged with the violation of any law, rule, or regulation of such Government;

(d) Whether or not that Government is prepared to and will recognize former subjects of Russia who are naturalized American citizens as American citizens and will accord to them all the rights of American citizens;

(e) Whether or not that Government is prepared, with respect to the war loans extended by our Treasury to fully accredited representatives of the Russian Government then in power, to place itself on the same footing as all the other governments which had borrowed from us during the war—that is, to acknowledge the obligation and to enter into proper negotiations for the discharging of such obligation; and

(f) Whether or not that Government is prepared to enter into negotiations for the satisfaction of the claims of our citizens who had suffered property damage because of acts initiated and carried out by authority of that Government.

The willingness of the Soviet Government to assume the undertakings herein enumerated should be embodied in formal declaration precedent to our act of recognition. The experience of other important nations, notably Great Britain and France, which had recognized the Soviet Government unconditionally, should serve as sufficient warning to us as to the difficulty of protecting and maintaining our national interests in the face of the international policies pursued by the Soviet Government in the absence of previous clearly defined undertakings on the part of that Government.

It is often asserted that recognition of the Soviet Government would result for our country in a large expansion of our export trade to Russia. This, it is held, would be of sufficient benefit to several important branches of agricultural and industrial production in the United States to render the act of recognition a step in the direction of promoting our best national interests.

The truth of this assertion should be another necessary field of inquiry for the American commission suggested above. From my personal investigation of this subject, I am convinced that no foundation whatever exists for the extravagant claims advanced in favor of outstanding trade benefits that would accrue to us as a result of our extending recognition to the Soviet Government. The possibility of our purchases from Russia, the proceeds of which could be used to pay for our exports to that country, is admittedly very limited. Our sales to Russia, over and above our purchases from her, would have to be governed by one of the following factors:

(1) A net balance in favor of Russia in her trade with her principal customers; that is, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and France;

(2) Exports of gold by her; and

(3) New credits extended to her in this country.

I am credibly informed that for some time ahead any visible net balance in favor of Russia in her trade with the principal European nations is bound to be absorbed by her payments to these countries on account of credits already extended to her by their citizens. Similarly, her stocks and current production of gold are relatively small. Hence, there would appear to be but a slight businesslike basis for the extension to her of any substantial volume of new credits.

All these questions will have to be thoroughly and authoritatively investigated before adequate judgment can be formed as to whether or not the recognition of the Soviet Government would, in fact, be in our best economic interest. Surely, no officials of our Government would be so oblivious of the disastrous consequences of our huge loans to foreign countries during the post-war years as to lay the foundation for a resumption of substantial loans abroad without a most careful investigation as to the soundness of such investments. In short, an unconditional recognition of the Soviet Government, prior to an adequate and authoritative investigation, and unaccompanied by a definite assumption by the Soviet Government of trustworthy undertakings along the lines here suggested, would be a rash and precipitate action, likely to be profoundly deplored all too soon after it is taken.

Mr. President, though not a prophet, time has vindicated the position which I took.

The present difficulties with Russia should have been foreseen. Whatever one may think of the social and economic objectives of the Communists, and conceding that in the beginning their motives were idealistic, the fact is that also from the beginning they made no concealment of the doctrine that the end justifies the means. This belief is expounded in some of the writings of Lenin himself.

The immorality of any such doctrine need not be stressed. It should be pointed out, however, that men and movements admitting the validity of any such principle, in the end always confuse ends with means, especially in situations where there arises a struggle for power, personal and political. That is the meaning of the saying that revolutions devour their own children. In the French Revolution it was the guillotine for personal and political opponents. In the Russian Revolution it is something more sordid. In Russia opponents are not even accorded the honor of a glamorous death, but either disappear without trace or are shot like dogs in cellars. I may say that I saw evidences of that when I was in Russia.

Many individuals, and, for that matter, many publications, in their sympathies for those they believed to be builders of a new society, for years either concealed or deliberately overlooked the methods used by the masters of Russia. The wanton attack on Finland has forced even them—most of them at any rate—to cry out in horror. There are people much less radical than Communists who are ready to use any means if they believe the objective to be laudable and desirable. The moral and ethical collapse of the Russian experiment carries a lesson to all these.

The fact is that even on the moral side the Russian, as well as the German, experiment has always represented extreme reaction. Throughout the centuries mankind slowly, gropingly, had built up a code of ethics which alone makes possible a semblance of civilized life. Here especially belongs the sanctity of a pledged word, of treaties, and respect for certain fundamental rights, especially of other nations. The Bolsheviks and Nazis have thrown over all these without creating anything resembling a moral code of their own. They have gone back to cavemen methods. Not only economically and socially, but morally, as well, they are the supreme reactionaries of our generation.

It is only to be hoped that the lesson they have meted out to their own friends will be permanent, and the lesson fully appreciated by those who knowingly or unknowingly have supported communism in this or in other lands.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AND NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7805) making supplemental appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments, Coast Guard, and Federal Bureau of Investigation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment on page 7, line 21, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the subhead "Acquisition of land", on page 7, line 21, after the figures "\$150,000" and the semicolon, it is proposed to strike out "and for the acquisition of approximately 800 acres in Puerto Rico for the establishment of a general depot and cantonment area and the enlargement of Camp Buchanan, as authorized in the acts of July 2, 1917, and April 11, 1918 (50 U. S. C. 171), \$200,000", and on page 8, line 2, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$550,000" and insert "\$350,000", so as to read:

For the acquisition of approximately 200,000 acres as a bombing area for use in connection with McChord Field, Wash., \$200,000; for the acquisition of approximately 48,000 acres as a bombing area in connection with Hamilton Field, Calif., \$150,000; in all, \$350,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the matter now before the Senate relates to the acquisition of land at San Juan, P. R.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Texas for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the matter under discussion is of considerable importance. The principle of it runs all through the bill. Before we begin the discussion of this subject I think we should have a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brown in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Mo.	Gurney	Maloney
Ashurst	Connally	Hale	Mead
Bailey	Danaher	Harrison	Miller
Bankhead	Davis	Hayden	Neely
Barbour	Donahey	Hayden	Norris
Barkley	Downey	Herring	Pepper
Bilbo	Elliander	Holman	Reed
Bridges	Frazier	Holt	Reynolds
Brown	George	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Bulow	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Byrd	Gibson	King	Schwellenbach
Byrnes	Gillette	Lucas	Shipstead
Capper	Glass	Lundeen	Slattery
Chandler	Green	McKellar	Smathers
Chavez	Guffey	McNary	Smith

Stewart  
Taft  
Thomas, Okla.

Tobey  
Townsend  
Truman

Tydings  
Van Nuys  
Wagner

Walsh  
Wheeler  
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Before the Senator from Oklahoma proceeds, the Chair feels that he ought to state the parliamentary situation. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 21 on page 7 and extending into line 2 on page 8, striking out the matter relative to the acquisition of 800 acres of land in Puerto Rico.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on a former date I occupied considerable time on the general question of expanding our national defense; and finally, at the close of my remarks, I touched upon the particular issue before us.

The issue before the Senate proposes to establish a policy for the acquisition of additional land for military purposes. On page 7, beginning in line 16, we find that the committee recommends the purchase of 200,000 acres of land to be used in conjunction with McChord Field, in Washington, to be used as a bombing area. As a part of our national defense we now have planes equipped for bombing purposes. The Government has constructed, or caused to be constructed, a large number of bombing planes. Those planes are for the particular purpose of carrying bombs and dropping them over strategic enemy points, such as forts, army camps, factories, railroads, canals, depots, and so forth. It seems to me that the bombing activity of the Army is now one of the major activities of the Army. That being true, it is entirely proper that we should buy land in Washington to enable the bombing planes in that area to drop bombs as a form of training practice.

Mr. President, bombs cannot be dropped in safety except over water or over land wholly uninhabited. So I am thoroughly in sympathy with and favor the acquisition of the land for the use of the bombing squadrons to test their ability in hitting targets from the air. So no question is raised about the 200,000 acres proposed to be acquired for McChord Field in Washington.

Next the committee recommends that we purchase 48,000 acres of land for use as a bombing area in connection with Hamilton Field, Calif., the 200,000 acres in Washington to cost \$200,000 and the 48,000 acres in California to cost \$150,000.

Mr. President, we have a large military establishment at Hamilton Field, located some 28 miles north of San Francisco. We have there many of the larger bombing planes. The whole area is an airplane establishment to train men to fly the planes and to drop the bombs accurately.

As I stated on a former occasion, we have now perfected a bombing sight which, when placed upon a bombing plane, enables the men who fly the plane to drop a bomb toward a target just as accurately as a cannon can be fired on the ground.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In what part of California is the proposed bombing area?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the bill does not state.

Mr. CONNALLY. It seems to me there is sufficient desert land in California, where a jack rabbit cannot even live, where we might acquire a tract for nothing. I would be in favor of that, but I would not want to buy a great quantity of expensive land around Hollywood.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the fact that the 48,000 acres will cost but \$150,000 is evidence that the land is not of great value for any other purpose. There is much land in California that is barren because it is arid and because it is too rocky for any other purpose; and while I do not know the exact location of this land, I take it that it is accessible to Hamilton Field.

A little later the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] will sponsor an amendment to buy land to be used in conjunction with a big airplane base near Denver. When that time comes I shall favor that project, because the land is necessary, and there is no land immediately adjacent to



Denver which is susceptible to that use and desirable for that purpose. So it is proposed to go across into Utah and buy some land in the State of the Senator from Utah (Mr. KING) around great Salt Lake, where the land is practically worthless desert land. I shall favor that proposal when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Are there not great areas of public lands in Colorado, California, and other States which the Government already has, and which might be used for bombing areas?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I can answer that question in part. Wherever a desirable bombing site can be found on public land, such land will not cost us anything. The only cost for land will be for land held in private ownership; and I take it that the California tract and the Washington tract are largely of that character of land.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish merely to answer part of the inquiry of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CONNALLY). In Colorado 100 square miles of land has been donated by the people of the First Congressional District for these purposes, all of which has been paid for by local funds. If bombs cannot be dropped with safety within an area of 100 square miles, of course, more land will have to be acquired.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Some may wonder why it is necessary to acquire such large tracts for the use of our bombing planes. The bombing planes travel at a high rate of speed. They travel at speeds from 140 to 250 miles an hour. So it would be utterly useless to try to use a small tract of land as a bombing area. To have the best efficiency it is necessary to have a sufficiently large tract of ground so that the planes can maneuver and place their targets where they will be safe from doing damage to property or to human habitations.

However, Mr. President, when the third item of this character in the bill came before the committee, an item proposing to acquire some 800 acres of land to be added to the existing small fort at San Juan, P. R., the committee struck the item from the bill. If the committee amendment is agreed to, we shall have in San Juan a military reservation of about 286 acres, and on that little reservation, much of which is rough land which cannot be used for any purpose except as a background for a target range, we shall have a large amount of ammunition stored under tarpaulins and canvas. We now have there a large amount of stores that should be housed. Those stores are outdoors, unprotected, under sheds, under planks, under tarpaulins, and under canvas. We also have a large amount of machinery and other equipment there. I call it "machinery." It is armament, ordnance—unprotected, out of doors, standing there exposed to the wind, the rain, and the sun. So we have a large quantity of equipment in a congested area, with no place to put it. On this small tract of ground a large number of soldiers are now living in tents.

Puerto Rico is a rough country. The island is small. The center looks like a ridge of a mountain range. The top of the mountain, of course, is worthless. Lower down the people grow coffee. Still lower down, on the benchland, they grow tobacco. Then along the coast, where the ground is low, and in the river bottoms, they grow sugarcane. The whole island is small, and in the area of San Juan there is little level land.

At a former date a board of Army engineers located what is now known as Fort Buchanan. It is too small for any military purpose except as a base for the present contingent of soldiers and the military supplies already there awaiting permanent housing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event the amendment should be adopted and we should acquire the extra land in Puerto Rico, has the Senator any figure to show how much it will cost to

put the land in shape to house the ammunition, matériel, and equipment which he has described?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am unprepared to answer that question fully; but I will make the statement that one of the first things to be done will be to build some suitable buildings for the storage of our ammunition, bombs, and shells. As to the extent of the necessary buildings, I am unable to say; but in my opinion that project is No. 1 in priority.

Second, at the same time we must build a form of shelter in which to house or store the supplies, such as groceries, provisions, and military equipment which must be used there later. In my opinion that project is No. 2 in priority.

Then No. 3: There must be developed at that point an airport. Such a field will not be expensive because there is a place for an airport which is practically level. The ground will have to be cleared of sugarcane, and there will be some ravines to be filled and some knolls to be leveled, but the work would not be expensive, nothing to compare with the expense incurred in other places where we are building airports throughout the United States. So that when we have that development completed, we will have at Fort Buchanan a modern military establishment.

Mr. TYDINGS. And with room to expand and to enlarge?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. We will have a place to store ammunition, that can be used by both the Army and the Navy, and another place for planes to land, for in that area there are few roads and only one railroad.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to divert the Senator, but my question was prompted by the thought that in Puerto Rico today the economic conditions are very bad. The Government is appropriating millions of dollars every year, in one form or another, in work relief and what not. That being so, it occurred to me that it would be wise, inasmuch as we are going to spend money there, if some of the money diverted to work relief and expended for work relief proper could be utilized at the same time in building these worthwhile projects as a matter of national defense. I do not know whether or not there is such coordination, but I hope there will be, because in that way we would get more for our money than in any other way that it could be spent in Puerto Rico.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to have that statement made, because I am prepared to say, from personal observation, that at every point in the United States, in Puerto Rico, and in Panama, where the War Department is making expansion, relief labor is being used. Many of the millions of dollars we have appropriated for relief purposes have been allocated to the War Department, and, in turn, the War Department is using those funds for relief purposes among the people of the respective areas who must have work. That is especially true in Puerto Rico.

At Borinquen, a point on the other end of Puerto Rico, literally thousands of men are building a large air base. So the very thing suggested by the Senator from Maryland is being done; and I approve of that policy.

Mr. President, before I return to the immediate question involved, there are one or two observations I desire to make to clear up some uncertainties that were left from the debate on a former day. I made the statement 2 days ago that production of our new modern rifle was at the rate of 100 per day. My statement was challenged. I did not at that time have my authority; I did not know that I would have occasion to use it. I now desire to place in the RECORD a few sentences from a letter received from the commandant of the United States armory located at Springfield, Mass., which is the only place where a single rifle of the kind referred to has been made and the only place where such rifles are being made, notwithstanding the fact that we have let a contract to the Winchester Arms Co. to make 65,000 of these rifles. The rifles to be manufactured by the Winchester Arms Co. will not be delivered for 2 years. That company has not made a single rifle and they cannot make a single rifle until they get the necessary tools. Orders have been

placed for the tools but all the tools have not been delivered; they will not be delivered for probably a year, and the company cannot make a single rifle until they have the proper tools. After a factory contracts to make a rifle of this character, it takes them from a year to 14 months to secure the tools. The Winchester Co. does not now have the tools, it has not built and assembled a single rifle, and does not have to deliver the rifles for 2 years. So the only place where the new rifles have been made, and the only place where they are being made, is in the armory owned by the United States and located at Springfield, Mass. Colonel Stewart, the commandant of that armory, is in full command there. I asked him to send me information about the production of these rifles, and I now read a few sentences from his letter. The letter is dated Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass., January 8, 1940. On the first page this sentence is found:

The current assembly is at the rate of 100 rifles per day, and within a few weeks the assembly will be increased to 200 rifles per day.

I submit this quotation in corroboration of my statement on a former occasion that the assembly now is only 100 rifles a day. They work 5 days a week; so 500 rifles are produced each week. With 4 weeks to a month, 2,000 rifles are produced each month, and at that rate there will be produced 24,000 rifles a year. That would be less than 100,000 rifles in 4 years. So, on this basis, we would have to wait 40 years in order to get a sufficient number of the rifles to equip an army of a million men. We have now in the Military Establishment in various branches almost a million men. They are not all in the Army, and not all would use these rifles, but we have many hundreds of thousands of men who should have these rifles. The Regular soldiers should have them; the National Guard should have them; the marines should have them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the Senator whether he has information to advise us whether it is contemplated that the new rifles shall supplant the rifles with which the Army is now equipped?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. The old Enfield rifle was a good rifle in its day; it was used back in the Spanish-American War. Then we had the Krag-Jorgensen rifle, the finest in its day, used in the Filipino Insurrection. Then we had the Springfield rifle, which was used in the World War, the finest rifle up to that time. We still have those old rifles; we are not devoid of rifles; we still have a good rifle; but it is not so good a rifle as a possible enemy might confront us with. The new rifle is an automatic rifle. It weighs just a few ounces more than an ordinary Army rifle, the kind we have had all these years. The old rifle would shoot but once, then the soldier would have to open the block, put in a shell, close the block, fire the gun, open the block, put in another shell, close the block and shoot. The new rifle is an automatic rifle. The cartridges come in clips of eight. A soldier can slip a clip into this gun, pull the trigger eight times; the shells fly out, then the clip flies out, and then he can put in another clip, and so on, indefinitely. With the new rifle an expert can shoot more than 30 times a minute. With this rifle one competent rifleman is equivalent to four or five as good riflemen with the old rifle.

The question is, If we are going to have an army, if we are going to have a navy, why not equip the Army and Navy with the best ammunition and the best guns that the mind and hand of men can devise? This issue does not come before the Senate at this time, but later on I shall ask the Senate to consider the proposal to speed up the production of the new, modern, efficient semiautomatic rifle. That question, however, I repeat, is not involved in the matter now before the Senate.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. For the purpose of securing information, I ask the Senator if it is contemplated that the new rifle will be universally used in regiments of infantry; that all infantry soldiers will use them, or is it contemplated that merely a group here and there in the Army shall use them?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is my understanding that our entire Army is to be equipped with this new rifle.

I think as fast as the new rifles can be produced all our soldiers, the Infantry, Cavalry, and the Marines, and all other members of the military and naval forces who need and use rifles, should be supplied with the new rifle. I say that it is the policy of the Government to produce these rifles as fast as the Congress will appropriate the money to make them. The money is necessary to pay the workers. Even though we make the rifles in our own plant on our own ground, the laboring men must be paid and the materials out of which the rifles are made must be paid for. The Government armory cannot make these rifles faster than the Congress will appropriate money to pay the men and to buy the materials.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not his opinion that the least we can do is to keep on hand and available the equipment that would be necessary and sufficient to put into the field immediately the minimum military force that our military authorities might expect us to mobilize and put in the field within a given time?

Let us suppose that there might be in the minds of the military authorities a schedule of having, we will say, 250,000 men who might be ready in 30 days, and another 250,000 men who might be ready in another 30 days. It seems to me it is consistent with the attitude that should characterize the action of a democracy not to call the men themselves actually into the service until they are imperatively required; but it seems to me the least we could do would be to have the equipment available, so that the only question would be, in time of war, how rapidly the men should be called in, and how rapidly they could be effectively mobilized.

Out of consciousness that it is a matter affecting our national defense, I hesitate to ask the Senator how many men the United States could immediately put into the field with all necessary modern equipment, according to the standards of a modern army; but I should like to have an intimation from the Senator as to whether it would be a large or a small force.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, so far as the infantry is concerned, we could not equip more men than we have made guns to date; and that is not in excess of 25,000, hence we could not put into the field today more than that number equipped with these modern guns.

I thank the Senator from Florida. I share his viewpoint. It is exactly the same as mine.

Mr. President, today we are enlisting men in the United States Army at a faster rate than we are making these new rifles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. While it is true that only a small number of the new rifles have been completed, the arsenal is at work on them now at the rate of about 100 a day, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is the present assembly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The present assembly. In addition, we have about 1,800,000 Springfield rifles, which are as good as any other rifles in the world, and we have some six or seven hundred thousand Enfield rifles, which are very excellent rifles.

We have 227,000 men in the standing Army today, and the number will be increased to 243,000 in a short time—within 30 days—I imagine. We also have about the same number of members of the National Guard, who could be put into service very readily. Under the present arrangement we certainly have enough rifles so that not more than 22,000 of the new rifles are required at present, in my judgment.



Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee. It is obvious that we are in better condition today than we were 20 years ago. Twenty years ago we called the boys to the colors; and when they came to the camps there were no guns for them and no ammunition, and they were forced to drill, so I am advised, with sticks for guns.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. A moment ago the Senator spoke about his desire to clear up some uncertainties. I do not want to embarrass the Senator at all, or embarrass the War Department; but I should like at this time to call attention to the last military appropriation act, which was approved on April 3, 1939; and I should like to quote section 4 of that act.

It reads:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion and under rules, regulations, and limitations to be prescribed by him, to lend to accredited civilian aviation schools, one or more of which shall be designated by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the training of any Negro air pilot, at which personnel of the Military Establishment are pursuing a course of education and training pursuant to detail thereto under competent orders of the War Department, out of aircraft, aircraft parts, aeronautical equipment and accessories for the Air Corps, on hand and belonging to the Government, such articles as may appear to be required for instruction, training, and maintenance purposes.

The Senator recalls that I offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate to provide facilities for training Negro aviators; and under the able New Deal leadership on the other side, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] offered a substitute which was approximately my amendment, which was carried, and provided for training Negro aviators. From information which has come to my attention I find that that provision of law has not been carried out; and to complete my statement, and in view of the question, I should like to read a letter written to Mr. Frank S. Reed, Jr., 5933 Lafayette Avenue, Chicago, Ill., under date of September 23, 1939:

DEAR SIR: With reference to your application for appointment as a flying cadet, you are informed that the War Department has taken final action on your application and that your transcript of college credits and other supporting papers have been returned to this headquarters with the statement that inasmuch as there are no units composed of colored men in the Air Corps at the present time, no provision has been made for their flying training, and, therefore, the War Department can take no further action with a view to giving you flying training at this time.

Your transcript of college credits and other papers which accompanied your application are returned herewith.

It is regretted that the nonexistence of a colored Air Corps unit to which you could be assigned in the event of completion of flying training precludes your training to become a military pilot at this time.

Very truly yours,

J. G. BRACKINRIDGE,  
Major, A. G. D.

I think that is rather a serious thing. I am in sympathy with these appropriations and the general purpose of this bill for national defense; but I should like to have it a matter of official record that that law was passed. It was passed, I assume, by Congress in good faith to provide training for the colored men of this country who desire to participate and secure training as aviators in the United States Army; and apparently the law today has been ignored. I should like to ask the Senator if he is aware of that fact, and, in going forward with this new military bill, what we shall have to do to secure action under the existing law; whether we shall have to reenact the present statute, or just what we shall have to do.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, many things go on of which the Senator from Oklahoma is not aware. I wish to reiterate what I said on a former occasion, that in the tour of our committee through the country we found one large fort devoted entirely to training colored soldiers. This group of colored soldiers passed in review before our committee. As stated on that former occasion, I have seen many reviews, and we saw many reviews throughout the United States; but the colored detachment at this fort located in southern Arizona put on the best review I have ever seen.

They were in perfect step. It seemed that they worked by machine. Every member of our delegation complimented upon the perfect marching of these colored soldiers.

As to the particular point raised by the Senator from New Hampshire, I am not advised. It is not within our purview. We are under no responsibility to administer these laws. That responsibility falls on another branch of the Government. If the other branch of the Government has been amiss in carrying out the instructions of Congress, of course the responsibility is upon that branch.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe we should go forward with new measures if previous laws which we have passed, which directly authorize the Government to provide the Negroes of this country facilities for aviation training, have been ignored? I mean, ought we not to get at the bottom of this thing before we proceed to enact new legislation, if existing legislation, now on the statute books, has been ignored?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, personally I do not presume to be speaking for the administrative branch of the Government. We have our responsibility to adopt policies and provide the money to carry out those policies. Then it is up to the executive branch of the Government to administer the policies with the money that is made available.

Mr. BRIDGES. Congress having passed a law to provide training for Negro aviators, has the Senator any suggestion as to just how Congress would go about seeing that the law is carried out?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I will leave that to the Senator who asked the question. Personally, I will say to the Senator that I am sure we have in this country many colored youngsters who would make good aviators. They would do well at any point at which they might be permitted to serve. They would make good on the ground. They would make good mechanics. They would make good pilots. I may say still further, however, that the places for recruiting soldiers are flooded with all kinds of applicants; and I wish to compliment the personnel of our military establishments, because we had a chance to see them at work. We found, wherever we went, that the youngsters desiring to enlist in the Army as a rule were high-school graduates; many of them had been to college; some were college graduates; yet they are willing and anxious to enlist in the Army of the United States.

Mr. President, the Army is becoming a highly efficient organization. It is a highly scientific organization. If anyone had the time to spend and inspected the exhibit at Bolling Field the past few days, no doubt he was edified and gratified to see there the component parts which go into the making of an airplane. I had no idea that there were so many parts to an airplane. When we look at an airplane all we see is a slick outside surface, and we do not think that the inside of that plane contains so many parts; but I am advised that to make one of the larger airplanes it takes about 45,000 parts. These parts of course are of various kinds and characters. From the outside the parts are not discernible, but when we go and look at the inside of an airplane, look at the engine, look into the control room, and at the various parts of the plane, we find that it is a mass of intricate parts. I presume they are necessary. If they were not necessary they would be eliminated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with everything the Senator has said about the efficiency of the War Department. I think it is one of the best departments of the Government, and I think it is well administered, and I am in general sympathy with the pending bill and in general sympathy with the defense program. But I do desire to point out, and I do want it very definitely understood, that for some reason or other the act of Congress relating to the training of colored aviators has been ignored, and I think the War Department

should have its attention called to that matter and that Congress should have some word as to why the administration here in Washington, headed by President Roosevelt, who claims to be so interested in these matters, has ignored the colored people of the country in that particular matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to read now one or two additional sentences from the letter from Colonel Stewart, in charge of the Springfield Armory. The question was asked as to whether or not the production of the rifles referred to could be speeded up, and this is the reply from the colonel:

It is possible and practicable to speed the production of rifles beyond the figure of 200 per day. This can be done by running the present layout on a 24-hour basis, in which case a production of four to five hundred per day could be reached in 5 to 6 months. This would require appropriations by the present Congress for about 125,000 rifles. Secondly, the plant production can be increased from 200 per 8-hour day to 400 per 8-hour day. To do this will require the following estimated amounts—

Then he gives an itemization of the necessary equipment which must be had in order to increase production to the figures mentioned. I think perhaps the Record should show this:

a. For a new factory building, 562 by 172 feet, for which space is available.....	\$500,000
b. For increased fire facilities.....	90,000
c. For new equipment and tooling.....	2,191,710
d. For a gage building and laboratory.....	91,000

I read further from the letter:

In addition to the foregoing, it would be very desirable to provide for the modernization of the equipment now installed in the present jobbing shop at an estimated cost of \$894,700. With these facilities provided for by appropriation of funds, the production could be increased to 400 per 8-hour day.

The time required to purchase and install the required building and equipment and to get into production on the basis of 400 rifles per 8-hour day would be about 1 year, provided that deliveries on essential equipment are not unduly delayed and are not slower than has been shown by our recent experience.

Another sentence:

This project will, of course, call for an increased appropriation for the manufacture of the rifles called for by the added production facilities. The cost of such rifles is estimated to be \$80 each.

Mr. President, even with all that outlay, these new rifles would cost an estimated amount of \$80 per rifle, but, as suggested on a former occasion, a contract has been let for 65,000 rifles at an estimated cost of \$120 a rifle. So, after all, if we are to make a million rifles, or some such number, it would be in the interest of efficiency and the saving of money to expand our own equipment at Springfield Armory so that we could make these rifles more rapidly and thus equip our soldiers more speedily.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Is there anything in the letter which it would not be well to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? I ask the Senator whether he will not offer for printing in the RECORD the entire letter?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the War Department does have military secrets, as I have discovered, but I cannot conceive of information of this kind being a military secret. It is current information that we have produced only about 22,000 or 23,000 of these rifles. It is current information that we are making only about a hundred a day, and anyone can figure how long it would take to supply the Army. If we are to speed up production, it is going to take money to get the equipment. I know of no reason why the entire letter should not be placed in the RECORD, and I ask it be printed at this point in my remarks, if there be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD ARMORY,  
Springfield, Mass., January 8, 1940.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: With reference to your telegram of January 6, the following is the situation at the Springfield Armory in regard to the production of semiautomatic rifles:

A year ago the armory was assembling rifles at the rate of 40 per 8-hour day, using old machinery, mostly of World War vintage or older, with which it was then equipped. In the meantime, while still keeping up production, it was actively engaged in designing, purchasing, installing, and getting into production a new line of modern machine tools which would have the capacity of producing 200 rifles per 8-hour day. This work has now been almost completed, although there is still a number of gaps caused by our inability to get sufficiently prompt delivery on all of the numerous machines, tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, and gages involved.

The current assembly is at the rate of 100 rifles per day, and within a few weeks the assembly will be increased to 200 rifles per day.

It is possible and practicable to speed the production of rifle beyond the figure of 200 per day. This can be done by running the present lay-out on a 24-hour basis, in which case a production of 400 to 500 per day could be reached in 5 to 6 months. This would require appropriations by the present Congress for about 125,000 rifles. Secondly, the plant production can be increased from 200 per 8-hour day to 400 per 8-hour day. To do this will require the following estimated amounts:

a. For a new factory building, 562 feet by 172 feet, for which space is available.....	\$500,000
b. For increased power facilities.....	90,000
c. For new equipment and tooling.....	2,191,710
d. For a gage building and laboratory.....	91,000

In addition to the foregoing, it would be very desirable to provide for the modernization of the equipment now installed in the present jobbing shop at an estimated cost of \$894,700. With these facilities provided for by appropriation of funds, the production could be increased to 400 per 8-hour day.

The time required to purchase and install the required building and equipment and to get into production on the basis of 400 rifles per 8-hour day would be about 1 year, provided that deliveries on essential equipment are not unduly delayed and are not slower than has been shown by our recent experience.

This project will, of course, call for an increased appropriation for the manufacture of the rifles called for by the added production facilities. The cost of such rifles is estimated to be \$80 each.

Very truly yours,

G. H. STEWART,

Colonel, Ordnance Department, Commanding.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the particular amendment before the Senate of itself is of little consequence; it probably would not make any difference whether we bought this land now or later; but if the Army and the Government are to fortify San Juan as one of the places necessary for the protection of the Panama Canal, then this land must be had. The question is, first, as to the desirability of the purchase of the land. If it is not desirable that it be purchased, we should not purchase it, of course. If it is desirable, then the question is, What about the price? Is the price a fair one?

In view of this situation I desire at this point to exhibit to the Senate a map showing the Panama Canal and the West Indies. In my hurried preparation for the session this afternoon I could find only a very small map of Puerto Rico and the West Indies and the Panama Canal; but I exhibit this small map to the Senate.

I point out on the map, first, Florida to the north, extending down in a southerly direction almost to Cuba. Just south of Florida is the island of Cuba. To the east of Cuba there are Haiti and the Dominican Republic. To the east of that island is Puerto Rico, as I indicate on the map. Still east of that and south are the Virgin Islands. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands belong to the United States.

To the west of this chain of islands known as the West Indies, first, we find Central America to the north and South America to the south, and at the narrowest point of the isthmus is the Panama Canal.

The main channels of trade by shipping going through the Panama Canal must follow one of a few lines. From the north the shipping line runs around the coast of Florida, over to the Gulf of Mexico, between Cuba and Central America, then south to the Panama Canal, as is shown by the first black line on the map.

The second line of shipping, which means shipping for all purposes, transportation of soldiers, the running of battleships, and what not, comes between Cuba and Haiti. It is possible for a large ship to go through that passageway straight into the Panama Canal.

The third line comes between Haiti and the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico. Ships may go through that channel. Another line comes in south of Puerto Rico and the



Virgin Islands and reaches Panama. Another line comes up from South America. But all the lines used by those who desire to pass through the Canal converge at the Panama Canal.

What places have we for defense of the Panama Canal outside of the Canal Zone? At the southern tip of Florida the Government is building a large airplane base at Tampa. It is for the special purpose of assembling there a large number of bombing planes, and to train the pilots to drop bombs from those planes to protect what might be called the strait, the water between Florida and Cuba. So we have at Tampa and Key West protective bases for the protection of the strait between Florida and Cuba.

Between Cuba and the Dominican Republic and Haiti we have a naval base, at the eastern end of Cuba. That is for the special purpose of protecting the passageway at that point. Then just across the channel between the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico and on the northern end of Puerto Rico, at Point Borinquen, we are building a large airplane base which can serve the whole Caribbean area. That is for the protection of this passageway between Cuba and the Dominican Republic and Haiti, and likewise between that island and Puerto Rico.

At San Juan we are building a larger base for the general protection of the whole Caribbean area.

For the protection of the Pacific coast we have fortified the Hawaiian Islands, and not only as a protection to Alaska, not only as a protection to the western part of the United States, but also the Panama Canal.

On the Atlantic side the Government has decided to develop a naval and military base at San Juan for the protection of all these channels of trade, and likewise for the protection of the eastern approach to the Canal Zone.

The question is, Do we need to develop these bases for the protection of American interests, not only interests in America but in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and Panama? I think it has been decided that we should develop these bases for our national defense. If that is not necessary, of course, we should not make this appropriation. If we should not develop these bases, then not only should we not make this appropriation but we should withdraw the Navy from San Juan, we should withdraw the Navy from the southern point of Cuba. Not only that, we should withdraw the Army from those points.

Mr. President, the question is as to whether or not this land can be had at a reasonable figure. Since last we met, I have made some investigation. I called the War Department and was referred to the Land Acquisition Division. I submit the following statements based upon information given me by the Land Acquisition Division of the War Department. I am advised that sugar land in Puerto Rico is worth from \$300 to \$500 an acre. I am advised that at Point Borinquen, which is the site for the aviation base at the north end of Puerto Rico, the Government paid over \$100 an acre for 1,883 acres of land located upon a bench or plateau as the base for the airfield development.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am extremely interested in what the Senator has to say, particularly in view of the fact that he, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States, has but recently visited the West Indies. The point I am particularly interested in is the price of \$400 an acre for sugar land in Puerto Rico. I wonder if the Senator has made an investigation of the price of land in Haiti and in the Dominican Republic in order that we might make a comparison of prices between sugar land in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am sorry, Mr. President, that I have not sought to acquire information relative to sugar lands in those areas. It would be valuable if we had the information. Limited time has confined my inquiries to Puerto Rico and to the United States. If the Senator will permit I will give the information I have received, and then we can perhaps get further information from some other Member of the Senate.

LXXXVI—43

At the point where they are building the large aviation base in northern Puerto Rico it will be necessary to acquire 800 acres of additional land. I saw the site myself. The soil is very shallow at the point where they are building the runways. Underneath the soil is a sort of white coral formation. This white coral formation is not solid rock, but it is the next thing to being solid rock. They are scraping the dirt off the top and when they fill up the ravine they will have a perfect runway there. It is not thought that they will have to put in hard surfacing on the runway because it is believed to be almost like rock, and the surface will be in fine shape for a runway. We landed on it ourselves, and I saw it first hand.

On the additional land wanted, however, is a sugar plantation, and the Department will probably recommend that we acquire 800 acres of land adjacent to the land already owned for the purpose of a depot, and it is estimated that land will cost \$275 an acre. That is 90 miles from San Juan. There is no town anywhere close to this land. It is upon a bench or plateau, 50 or 75 feet above the ocean. It is comparatively level. There is no town in sight. The land is now growing sugarcane. The estimated cost of this land needed at Point Borinquen is \$275 per acre, or about \$220,000 in all.

In addition to that information I called the Delegate from Puerto Rico. Unfortunately he was ill and I could not reach him, but I reached two other gentlemen in the city of Washington who claimed to be familiar with land values in Puerto Rico, and I shall give the Senate their statements for what they are worth.

I have here the statement of Francisco A. Lopez Dominguez. He is a native of Puerto Rico, born there and lived there all his life. Most of the time he has lived near San Juan. He was professor in the university in San Juan. Then later he was director of the agricultural extension station close to San Juan. So with that background I felt free to ask him questions about the cost and the value of land in San Juan, and here are some of his statements. I will not give them all because some of them are qualifying statements.

Sugarcane land varies in price in accordance with the quality of the land and in accordance with the location of the land, but it may be stated that ordinarily this land, this sugarcane land, is worth from \$300 to \$600 an acre. Some sales have been made for as much as \$1,000 per acre. There may be some inferior sugarcane lands that may be had for \$200 or \$150, dependent on the location and the conditions, but this river-bottom land is worth from \$300 to \$600 per acre.

That is the statement of this native Puerto Rican, who was a teacher in the university, later on was in the cabinet, and was director of the agricultural experiment station, which should indicate that he had close contact with the agricultural interests and especially the soil of Puerto Rico.

Later on this same gentleman said:

But included in that area—

That means the area that we desire to acquire for addition to Fort Buchanan—

But included in that area is sugarcane land which is river-bottom land that would be worth \$500 an acre and maybe \$600. There may be another type of soil there that is good for sugarcane, but it would be of an inferior quality and would be worth probably \$300 per acre.

Still quoting:

Now, there is land there that is not used for sugarcane, land upon which there is a dairy establishment, and the land would be worth \$300 to \$500 an acre.

That to me, of course, seems very high, but nevertheless that is his statement. I think he did not state in this transcript, but he stated to me either before or after this testimony was taken, that the present sugarcane owners in Puerto Rico have quotas, and those quotas cannot be increased. The fact that a quota exists for the production of sugarcane makes the land that now has sugarcane growing on it more valuable. How much more so I cannot say. But at the present time the sugarcane crop is almost ready for cutting. In another month or 6 weeks they will be cutting the cane in Puerto Rico. So the land is worth more now than it will be worth 2 months from now, because if you

buy the land now and take possession of the land now you take possession of it with the sugarcane growing.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I inquire of the Senator if it is his opinion that if the sugar quota of Puerto Rico were reduced it would automatically, in line with his argument, reduce the value of the land?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the sugar quotas were reduced in Puerto Rico it would reduce the value of much of the sugarcane land, but such action would increase the value of the particular land remaining with a valid quota for the production of sugar.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But why would the possessors of any particular section of land be advantaged over others who own sections of land engaged in the growing of sugar if the sugar quota were reduced?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, Puerto Rico is an American possession. At least we exercise some sort of rule over that territory. So long as we do we must be at least humane toward the people who live in Puerto Rico. Sugar is the main crop produced on the island, hence we must be fair and just to those people and afford them a chance to exist. If we are not willing to do this then we should give Puerto Rico its freedom exactly as we did Cuba and are now doing to the Philippines.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I simply wish to observe that the figures as to the price of sugar land in Puerto Rico indicate that the sugar industry in Puerto Rico is a profitable industry, and it does not quite correspond with the statement which some of the representatives of Puerto Rico make when sugar legislation is under consideration. I am glad to have these figures in the RECORD, because we will soon have sugar legislation under consideration, and when representatives of the sugar people come before us with statements of their distressed condition we may remind them of these figures.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is obvious to anyone who will visit Puerto Rico that these better lands are held by a relatively few people. They are not all American citizens, I will say. The natives as a rule are not able to own these sugar lands.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, has the War Department made a recommendation, in addition to the actual physical acquisition of the land, with respect to the price?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, General Daley, in charge of the military establishments in Puerto Rico, who has all this under his control, sent in a telegram on the 5th of December last, and it is in the RECORD of our last session; and if I remember correctly, he reports that this land can be bought for \$320 an acre.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Three hundred and twenty dollars an acre?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. That was as of December 5 last. Since that time it has been decided by the War Department not to acquire this land until after the sugar has been removed. The present sugar crop will be removed from the land in the next 6 weeks or 2 months. Should funds be made available, it is not actually proposed to take possession of this land until after the present sugar crop has been cut and removed. Such a policy may enable the land to be purchased at a lesser figure.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Do I understand that we can acquire the land for a purchase price of \$320 an acre now?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; as of December 5 last.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And then when they have brought about the removal of the sugarcane from the acres of actual production the value of the cane would be taken off of the \$320.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is my understanding.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I want the Senator to understand that I am not trying to pick a quarrel about this matter. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I did not have the opportunity to visit the island, as did the Senator. Knowing the Senator as I do, and knowing his great interest in national defense, I should like to ask the Senator, with his knowledge of real

estate and his knowledge of military affairs, he having actually been upon that land and seen the land, whether or not it is the Senator's personal opinion, as well as his official opinion, that we ought to acquire the land. I am dependent upon the Senator's recommendation. I happen to have had the honor of serving on the Military Affairs Committee with the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall answer that question somewhat at length.

Heretofore the Government, acting through the War Department, has actually established a fort at San Juan. It is called Fort Buchanan. This particular fort embraces about 286 acres of land. The land desired to be acquired is immediately adjacent to Fort Buchanan. So if we acquire the land desired, it will all become one compact tract. It is the only land adjacent to Fort Buchanan which is suitable; and I am advised—and I think correctly—that there is no other land adjacent to San Juan that is nearly so suitable for this purpose as is the proposed land. If we should go somewhere else to acquire land for the proposed depot, cantonment, airport, magazine, or arsenal we should have to abandon Fort Buchanan, and I am advised that there is no other place available which could be bought for anything like the amount of money this land could be bought for; and there is no other land available that is so well adapted to the purpose as is the land under consideration, for three reasons:

First. A railroad runs to and through this land. So far as I know, there is only one railroad in Puerto Rico. That is the railroad which runs up and down the coast on the east side of the island. The railroad goes to Fort Buchanan, and either into or immediately adjacent to the land desired to be acquired. That is reason No. 1.

Reason No. 2. There is a good road to this land. There is a hard-surfaced road from San Juan to Fort Buchanan, and Fort Buchanan is immediately adjacent to this land. So we have not only a railroad already in operation to the land but also a good, hard-surfaced road from San Juan to the land.

Reason No. 3. Either on this land or immediately adjacent thereto is a limestone quarry affording rock in the first instance. Secondly, at this quarry is an existing, operating cement plant. In the construction of an Army post, depot, or magazine the Government must have not only rock but also cement. There are both limestone and cement either on the land or immediately adjacent to it. At some points we have found the Government hauling sand and gravel 50 or 75 miles to build military establishments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I merely wish to ascertain whether or not my information is correct, as gathered from the statement heretofore made by the able Senator from Oklahoma, that the average price of sugar-producing land in Puerto Rico is between \$400 and \$500 an acre.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The information I have is that the price varies according to location. At some points it runs as low as \$150 an acre, and in some places sugar-producing land sells for as much as \$1,000 an acre. So the average should be in the range from \$300 to \$500.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not true that the values are based somewhat upon the quotas permitted in the matter of importation of sugar into this country?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That must be so.

Mr. McNARY. The sugar-beet producers in this country, the value of whose land is not at all comparable to the values mentioned, have complained about foreign quotas. I think they have a just complaint. If it is now said to us that sugar land in Puerto Rico is worth between \$400 and \$500 an acre I think we could well reduce the sugar quota, because it is away out of line with the value of lands in this country which produce the same food product.

I think the Senator has made a very great contribution. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Oregon. In reply to his suggestion, I will say that earlier in the day I inquired of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the



Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], as to the value of sugar-producing lands in the United States. The Senator from Utah is not present; but I will make the statement, subject to correction, that sugar-beet land adjacent to a sugar mill is worth approximately \$250 an acre. I refer to the better land.

The Senator from Florida is not present. I asked him about sugar land in Florida, and Florida has some of the finest sugar land I have ever seen. If I do not misquote him, he stated that the better land sold for approximately the same price; that is, \$250 per acre.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is now in the Chamber. I now ask him the same question. How much is the better sugar land in Louisiana worth? I refer to land close to the mills.

Mr. ELLENDER. From \$100 to \$150 an acre.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. So there is a wide range in the cost of sugar land, even in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will add that the average price of much so-called sugar land is as low as \$50, depending upon the proximity of the land to the mill.

I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield. I understood the Senator to say, day before yesterday, that in the tract under consideration 200 or 300 acres are now planted in sugar cane. Am I correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Something like that.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that the rest of it is pasture land.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that the sugarcane land must be irrigated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is not correct. The sugarcane land on one side of the island does have to be irrigated, because there is little rainfall. However, on the other side, on the San Juan side, there is ample rainfall to produce sugarcane without irrigation.

Mr. President, I shall occupy the time of the Senate for only a few moments longer. Quoting still further from the native Puerto Rican who was a professor in the college and director of an agricultural experiment station, I asked him the direct question:

Q. This tract is reported to be worth from \$320 to \$400 per acre. Do you regard that as an excessive cost?

A. I do not think so. That same type of land in another location would be less, but right there it is worth that money. If you were to assess it for its strictly agricultural value outside of San Juan, the price would be less, but where it is located that price is not excessive.

Mr. President, confirming the statement made by the director of the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, I had occasion to interview another gentleman, and I shall read some statements from the information given me.

This statement is from Mr. J. A. Dickey. He states that he went to Puerto Rico in 1929 as an expert in agriculture, as a member of the staff of the Brookings Institution. The institution was conducting a survey of the economics of the island. I asked him how long he remained in Puerto Rico. He said he spent 6 months on the island in intensive study. I asked him if he had been back recently. His reply was:

Have been back in some capacity for the Government at least once a year, or in a private capacity at least once a year, all of which had to do with agriculture.

I desire to read one or two sentences from his statement:

Any land that will grow good sugarcane is valued from \$300 to \$1,000 per acre. We know of actual transactions of land in sugarcane that sold as high as \$1,000 per acre where there was no irrigation.

Then I asked him what irrigated sugar land was worth. He said:

About the same. It happens to be land where there is rain and it does not need irrigation. There is rain on the north side. That \$1,000 land was sold about 10 years ago or more.

Then I asked him:

Has cane land increased or decreased in value?

His answer was:

The island has become more dependent on sugarcane as time goes on, and as a result the land has become more valuable. Since

the island depends almost entirely for its livelihood on sugarcane, it is but natural that any land suitable for sugarcane would be high in value.

Quoting further from the statement of Mr. Dickey:

Q. Please state, if you will, the accessibility of this proposed tract of land to transportation, such as, first, railroads; second, wagon road; and, third, water transportation.

A. The property has a railroad running right by it. Right by the camp.

Q. You mean Fort Buchanan?

A. Yes.

Q. This land is adjacent?

A. Yes; and it has a hard-surfaced highway running to and through the land to Fort Buchanan.

Mr. President, I think the issue has been sufficiently drawn. So far as I am concerned, it is simply a question of whether or not the Senate desires to fortify San Juan as one of our main bases for the protection of the West Indies, the United States, and the Panama Canal. If we want to do that, it will be necessary to buy some land on which to keep our soldiers. If we do not want to do it, of course, we will not, and we can bring the soldiers out, because they are living there in tents. To date we have spent comparatively little money in San Juan; but we now have several hundred of our people down there, and I think probably about 2,000 soldiers.

So I submit the issue, that the committee amendment should not be agreed to, and that the Senate should cooperate with the House of Representatives and make available \$200,000 with which to buy land upon which to build the proposed airport, general depot, and cantonment for the soldiers at San Juan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, beginning in line 21.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I gather from the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma that the conclusion is that there is no money provided in the pending bill for Puerto Rico; that we have entirely stripped the bill of any benefits for Puerto Rico. In the paragraph preceding the one in which the provision sought to be stricken out appears there is an item of \$319,000 for Puerto Rico. From the statement of the House committee it appears that \$945,000 are estimated for the purpose of temporary construction in Puerto Rico. There is a very liberal appropriation in this bill for Puerto Rico. We are taking out an item for the purchase of land. The committee was impressed with the fact that the price for the land is extravagant. We have been told by the able Senator from Oklahoma that if we wait a little while the sugar crop will be harvested and we can buy the land for less. If the Senate will strike out this item from the bill, we will be sure of waiting for a little while. There is no emergency about it and I think the committee's effort to hold expenditures down a little should meet the approval of the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in the concluding remarks of my distinguished friend from the State of Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] he stated it was a question whether or not we were desirous of fortifying the West Indies, that is to say, strengthening our outpost at San Juan in Puerto Rico. Insofar as this particular argument is concerned, it is my feeling that it is not a question of whether or not we are desirous of strengthening our national defense at one of our outposts, that in Puerto Rico; but, as I believe all Senators will agree, the issue is one that relates exclusively to whether or not we shall acquire a certain tract of land at the price at which it has been offered, therefore evolving into the question whether or not we shall accept the committee amendment, which would bring about a reduction of the appropriation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I may say that no possible harm could be done by accepting the amendment of the committee for the reason that the general appropriation bill will come before the committee, I imagine, within 30 days, or 60 days at the outside. At that time, all the facts may be ascertained, and if it should develop that the land in question is

the only land in Puerto Rico which is suitable and available for the particular purpose and that we will have to buy it in order to carry out the plans of the Army, the purchase could then be made. The only trouble is that the Army officers have not as yet given us the information that is absolutely necessary. The idea of paying \$400 an acre for 800 acres of land—

Mr. REYNOLDS. My understanding is that the price is \$320 an acre.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; \$400 an acre. The record shows that to be unquestioned.

Mr. REYNOLDS. May I be pardoned for making an inquiry of the Senator from Oklahoma? Will he state what the figures are with reference to the proposed payment for the land an acre?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will state that a telegram from General Daley, in command of the Military Establishment at Puerto Rico, under date of December 5, gave the estimated cost, as I recall, of \$320 per acre.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is some help. It shows that the action of the committee has not been in vain to that extent. The testimony of the Army officers is that of the 800 acres of land some 40 percent is tillable, 35 percent is pasture land, and 20 percent is land which, because of its very rugged character, cannot be used for any purpose, and so it is called waste land in the testimony. The proposal to pay a price of \$400 an acre for three kinds of land in Puerto Rico when we have to buy all, apparently, in order to get what can be used, and when we know the conditions which exist there seems at least to be somewhat unusual, and our committee, in looking after the interests of the Government and the interests of the Army, would like to have a little more time to go into it. We can secure the time by adopting the amendment and letting the matter go over to the general appropriation bill, which will be taken up by the committee within the next 60 days at the outside and, I imagine, within the next 30 days.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a suggestion?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS. I think the view of the Army as to what is proposed to be paid for this land was made very clear in the request which was made for the appropriation. They asked for \$320,000, or \$400 an acre. The House cut the amount to \$200,000. Now, if we put it on the basis of \$320 per acre instead of \$400 an acre, it would still take \$256,000. That is, \$200,000 would not buy the 800 acres at either of these figures.

It seems to me that we are drifting as to the value of the land, and that there is no haste about it, and no injury to the national defense would come by adopting the amendment. Such action would not close the matter, because the conference committee will meet, and there will still be an opportunity to discuss the matter with the House conferees, and perhaps in the light of further information—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in pursuance of what I was about to say, I wish to repeat that it is not a question of whether or not we are desirous of fortifying and refortifying or strengthening our outposts for the purpose of national defense in the Caribbean or elsewhere. We are all agreed that we are desirous of providing for ourselves an adequate national defense, whether it be by the upbuilding and development of our armed forces within the bounds of continental United States or in our possessions.

It is quite true, as evidenced, as we observe, and as we knew heretofore as the result of the very well prepared maps exhibited by my distinguished and able colleague from Oklahoma, that in order to protect our vital military interests in Panama, particularly in the zone which we occupy, we should have adequate fortifications in the Caribbean; that we should build up those fortifications and strengthen them in various spheres in the Caribbean where we have interests, particularly in the three main Virgin Islands, and at San Juan, and Fort Buchanan, in Puerto Rico.

I may add, in this connection, that, insofar as I am concerned, I want to see those fortifications strengthened, and

I would that we could perhaps acquire for fortifications some portion of land in the immediate proximity of the Dominican Republic, which is on one of the islands of the Caribbean, and whose capital is Trujillo. I mention that for the reason that former President Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, during the last several years brought about the expenditure of several million dollars for dredging the port and making it available for ships drawing from 20 to 30 feet of water, according to the information I have.

Furthermore, in reference to our interests in the Caribbean, I wish we could go farther south, say, to Martinique, a French possession. As a matter of fact, I wish it were possible to go to Port of Spain, in Trinidad, because we need fortifications there, particularly because of the ships, perhaps enemy ships, coming up the South American coast between Port of Spain and smaller ports in the northern part of the Caribbean.

While I am provided the opportunity to speak about the outposts in the Caribbean, I wish to remind Members of this body who are interested as enthusiastically as I am in regard to the national defense that when we are talking about the fortification of our defenses in the Caribbean, all the time we are referring to the defenses in the southern Atlantic. I take this opportunity to remind the Senate of the fact that we have no outposts in the North Atlantic. The farthest north that we have friendly interests in the Atlantic is the Republic of Haiti, the capital of which is Port-au-Prince. I wish to repeat what I have stated upon the floor of this Chamber many times, that I would that it were possible for our friends across the sea, in liquidation of their obligations, to consent to convey to us some of their property in the Western Hemisphere, namely, Bermuda, which is only 500 miles directly east of the coast of North Carolina, the seaport and capital of which is Hamilton. Ninety-five percent of all the revenue that goes into the port of Hamilton comes out of the metropolitan section of the city of New York. If it should not be possible to make that acquisition, then I suggest that, possibly, by some form of barter or other equitable arrangement we could acquire in the North Atlantic the islands of Bimini and Nassau, which may be reached from Miami by the Pan American Airways within an hour's flight. They are almost in our backyard, and what we really need is some outpost in the North Atlantic.

In particular reference to the question before us, and the issue as to whether or not we shall agree to pay \$320 an acre for that land, less the value of the sugar that is taken off each acre within 2 months from the present time, I am in agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I believe we have nothing to lose by letting this matter rest for a while, and accepting for the present the version of the Committee on Appropriations, which has this particular matter in hand. I think we will profit by so doing.

Mr. President, a moment ago I inquired of the junior Senator from Louisiana what was the price of fine sugar lands in Louisiana. As we know, Louisiana is the largest producer of cane, and of sugar made from sugarcane, of any State in the Union. He told me a moment ago, when he was here, that good, productive, fertile, black-soil sugar land could be bought in Louisiana for \$100 an acre. It strikes me that \$320 an acre is a high price to pay for an average run of land, as mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] a moment ago when he advised the Senate that according to his interpretation of the matter this is an aggregation of waste land, sugar land, and grazing land. By way of comparison, in order that we may ascertain for ourselves about that, I do not believe land in Puerto Rico is going to advance any more rapidly than land is going to advance in the immediate vicinity of the Capitol under the dome of which we sit and talk at the present time.

By way of comparison, I desire to say that within 18 miles of the place where I now stand in the Senate Chamber fine grazing land can be bought for \$25 an acre. I know of 1,200 acres that can be bought at \$25 an acre within 30 minutes' safe drive from here by automobile, over an improved highway. I know of a great deal of land in Virginia and Mary-



land and in all of our Southern States and in the Northern States, too, that can be bought for that price. I think we should accept the recommendation of the committee on this matter, and I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma probably will not object if the matter shall go over for a few months, after which we may be able to buy the land at a smaller figure.

So far as the question of national defense is concerned, there is no hurry. We are talking about land in the Caribbean which is close to the possessions of Europe. The people in Europe are going to be engaged for a long, long time in the bloody war which they started. I do not know who started it, but whoever started it should be allowed to finish it. It is none of our business. They are not going to attack us; and after the war is over it will be a quarter of a century before any of them will be able to get back to the position of strength which they occupied before the beginning of the war. So, as for time, we have 25 years in which to develop our fortifications in the Caribbean. Therefore I respectfully suggest that we accept the recommendations of the committee and let it go at that, because we have a great deal of time in which to acquire this land; and as time goes on the land may become of less value, particularly if we reduce the quota of sugar from Puerto Rico so that perhaps some of the sugar-cane producers of the South and the beet-sugar producers of Colorado may raise the price of their land here in the United States, instead of maintaining the price of land in Puerto Rico. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] salutes me. I accept his salute. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall occupy just 1 other moment. I desire to place in the RECORD three excerpts from an article published in the magazine *Current History* for January 1940. The article is entitled "Military Strategy and Tactics," and is by Maj. Leonard Nason. Inasmuch as these three paragraphs are very short, I shall read them:

Perhaps you begin to wonder why soldiers did not predict this present war. They did predict it, and not only that, it was as inevitable as the running of a river to the sea; they predicted in print and in conversation the year it would break out.

And why didn't anyone hear about it? Because they wouldn't listen.

On page 17 of the magazine we find an illustration giving the relative number of men of military age of the various nations of the world. The illustration in this magazine article, prepared by Maj. Leonard Nason—a famous military writer—illustrates and shows that the United States has men of military age—meaning from 15 to 49 years of age—of a total number of 33,000,000. Germany and Italy, according to this illustration, have men of war age of a total number of 33,800,000. If this illustration is correct, the two nations of Germany and Italy together have more men of military age than has the United States. From this illustration we find that Great Britain and France have men of military age of the number of 22,000,000. We find that Japan has men of military age of the number of 15,900,000.

Then, Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD the last paragraph of this article:

In the last war this country lived in a dream world in which the horrible reality of the war in Europe was kept from it. By the time returning soldiers could get home to tell about it in any numbers it was over, and public opinion hurriedly buried reference to it, lest it find something in the tale of which to be ashamed.

Now, in facing another war, let us face the truth—that this one is a result of blind refusal to recognize planned aggression, of hysterical hope that the nations of Europe would not go to war, and the childlike trust that when Hitler and Stalin threatened the world with attack they did not mean it. Let us not, in the name of the countless thousands who died as a result of our unpreparedness in the last war, again shriek that we will not be involved in this one, and, like so many ostriches, plunge our heads back into the sand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays may be had upon this amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, unanimous consent is not required to obtain the yeas and nays. There is a regular way of securing the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMATHERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Hatch	Reed
Bailey	Davis	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Donahey	Herring	Schwartz
Barbour	Ellender	Holman	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Frazier	Holt	Shipstead
Brown	George	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Gibson	King	Taft
Byrnes	Gillette	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Glass	Lundeen	Tobey
Chandler	Green	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	Guffey	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Gurney	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Harrison	Mead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 7, line 21.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CONNALLY. My colleague the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is absent because of illness.

Mr. MCKELLAR (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BYRNES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I am advised, however, that if present, the Senator from Maine would vote as I have voted, and I therefore permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of illness.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is detained from the Senate attending a hearing before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on the Norris-Sparkman tax replacement bill. He is paired on this question with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea" on the pending committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are members of the committee appointed to attend the funeral in Idaho of the late Senator Borah, and are, therefore, absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained in various Government departments.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on official business for the Special Committee on Civil Liberties.

I announce the following general pairs: The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 10, as follows:

## YEAS—45

Adams	Danaher	Hayden	Reed
Bailey	Davis	Herring	Reynolds
Bankhead	Donahay	Holman	Shipstead
Barkley	Ellender	Holt	Smathers
Brown	Frazier	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	George	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Gerry	King	Tobey
Byrnes	Gibson	Lucas	Walsh
Capper	Gillette	McKellar	Wheeler
Chandler	Glass	McNary	
Clark, Mo.	Harrison	Maloney	
Connally	Hatch	Mead	

## NAYS—10

Barbour	Guffey	Schwartz	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Gurney	Schwellenbach	Truman
Green	Lundeen		

## NOT VOTING—40

Andrews	Hale	Neely	Slattery
Ashurst	Hill	Norris	Stewart
Austin	Hughes	Nye	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	La Follette	O'Mahoney	Townsend
Bone	Lee	Overton	Tydings
Bridges	Lodge	Pepper	Vandenberg
Burke	McCarran	Pittman	Van Nuys
Caraway	Miller	Radcliffe	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Minton	Russell	White
Downey	Murray	Sheppard	Wiley

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading, "Barracks and quarters and other buildings and utilities", on page 8, line 10, to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$9,500,000", so as to read:

For an additional amount for barracks and quarters and other buildings and utilities, comprising the same objects specified under this head in the Military Appropriation Act, 1940, including general overhead expenses of transportation, engineering, supplies, inspection, and supervision, \$9,500,000.

## RESTRICTION AND REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, my colleagues are aware that Senate bill 409, which bears my name, is listed on the current calendar of business as order No. 817. There are certain facts in regard to this bill which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate, before it is called up for consideration.

Senate bill 409 was reported to the Senate on July 11, 1939, with amendments, on behalf of the Committee on Immigration of the Senate. I may add that this bill is accompanied by a report, No. 757.

I am deeply appreciative of the fact that my colleagues on the Committee on Immigration of the Senate desired to show me the courtesy of attaching my name to Senate bill 409, although I am not a member of the committee, so that I might have what credit there may be, should this bill, as sponsored by the committee, be passed.

Unfortunately, Senate bill 409, as reported by the Committee on Immigration, is not merely a digest or compilation of the principles of legislation which I sponsored in Senate bills 407, 408, 409, 410, and 411, as a superficial examination might suggest, but embodies extraneous matter of a character which is repugnant to every view of the immigration and alien problem in the United States which I have expressed on this floor many times. For this reason, Mr. President, I wish at this time to avail myself of the opportunity to advise the Members of the Senate as to why I and some of my colleagues must oppose consideration of Senate bill 409, as it has been reported by the Committee on Immigration.

In the first place, regarding section 1 of Senate bill 409, instead of my proposal that all immigration into the United States be suspended for a period of 10 years, or until such time as the Department of Labor shall certify to Congress that unemployment in the United States does not exceed 3,000,000 persons, my colleagues on the Committee on Immigration have proposed an arbitrary suspension of 5 years, without regard to the extent of unemployment in the United States. This particular feature to which I refer, I may say to the Senate quite frankly, is not the really vital objection I have to the bill as reported by my colleagues.

In the second place, the provision of section 5 in Senate bill 409, as reported, involves other and very serious objections. Section 5 lifts to the status of nonquota immigrants a class of immigrants who are, under the existing quota act, only entitled to preference in consideration of their application for entry under the quota. In other words, this section raises or lifts a class of immigrants now entitled only to preference in their applications for quota visas to a position which exempts them from any numerical limitation on their entrance. It simply makes them nonquota immigrants. Let me emphasize the fact that section 5 abolishes all numerical limitation upon the entry of immigrants of this class. Under the present law—sections 4, 6, and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924—a citizen of the United States is entitled to bring in his wife, or husband, as the case may be, or unmarried child under 21, as a nonquota immigrant; but section 5 of Senate bill 409 would grant these privileges to immigrants who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who have not become citizens. In other words, the noncitizen is placed on the basis with the citizen—and that being the case, there are 3,628,103 aliens here who under this section would be entitled to bring in their relatives as nonquota immigrants, without any limitation whatsoever upon their number. This, Mr. President, is a very serious matter. If we take as correct—which I do not concede—the official estimate of the number of aliens in the United States at the present time, including all immigrants legally or illegally in the country, the very latest official estimate of approximately 3,628,103 is so huge that it suggests possibilities of an immigration of relatives of persons here which would make a mockery of our policy of restricting immigration into the United States. I know it will be urged that under existing conditions the number of applications for the entry of relatives does not reach totals which should cause alarm; but, Mr. President, with the lid completely off, no numerical limitation being provided for, I cannot allow my name to be associated with the creation of a loophole in our immigration barriers which may utterly destroy the structure which has been laboriously built up by our predecessors.

I will say, in connection with section 5 of Senate bill 409, that later on in the course of my remarks I shall suggest a modification of section 1 of Senate bill 409, as reported by the Committee on Immigration, which should meet every legitimate aspiration of immigrants who have been lawfully admitted to the United States in years gone by for the reunion in this country of their families, from which they voluntarily separated themselves abroad for the purpose of coming to the United States.

In the third place, let me now turn to section 7 of the bill S. 409 as reported by the Committee on Immigration of the Senate. This section provides for an amendment to the seventh proviso of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (35 Stat. 875, U. S. C.), now on the statute books, which in my opinion has been the subject of flagrant misinterpretation of the intent of Congress when the basic act of 1917 was enacted.

Let us see what the seventh proviso permits. First as to facts upon which to base an example: It was stated by a former Commissioner of Immigration of this administration that there are 20,000 habitual alien criminals who are not subject to deportation, due to defects in our existing law. In addition to those 20,000 there are in the United States an unknown number of aliens who came here illegally. The latter class of aliens are deportable.



Example A: An alien enters the United States illegally. He remains here illegally for 7 years. By reason of his illegal entry he cannot become an American citizen.

Example B: An alien enters this country legally, and remains here legally for 7 years. While here he commits a crime for which he can be deported only if that crime involves a sentence of 1 year or more in jail and he was committed to prison within 5 years after entrance. With that bad record as an undesirable alien, his chance of becoming an American citizen is practically nil.

Under the seventh proviso, aliens belonging to examples A and B have been permitted by the Secretary of Labor to go to Canada, and from there lawfully to reenter this country. With this lawful reentry as their background, they obtain a clean slate for application for American citizenship, and they cannot be deported by reason of any previous violation of the immigration law.

Mr. President, when Congress enacted the seventh proviso of 1917 it certainly never intended an interpretation such as would permit the evasion of immigration laws enacted by it, which evasion is being practiced by the present Secretary of Labor. If the Senate desires specific information upon this particular evasion of the law, I respectfully direct attention to the hearings on the Department of State appropriation bill for 1939 (p. 46) and the Department of Labor appropriation bill for 1939 (p. 250).

As the committee has redrafted the seventh proviso in Senate bill 409, it would actually legalize the practice pursued by the Department of Labor for the past 6 years. In other words, according to the redraft of the seventh proviso by the committee, it would be possible for an alien who had been a resident of this country for a period of 7 years or more to reenter, although he were of a character or class ineligible to pass the existing requirements of admission as a new immigrant. On previous occasions I have pointed out that the Secretary of Labor has permitted a large number of criminal aliens, who were protected under the existing statutes from deportation by reason of their long residence in the United States, to go into Canada and return with a clean bill of health, thereby becoming eligible for citizenship. As I have previously stated, this redraft of the seventh proviso would legalize this practice. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this redraft of the seventh proviso accentuates the vice of our existing statutes, under which many habitual alien criminals cannot be eliminated from our population once and for all.

In the fourth place, I am emphatically opposed to the enactment of Senate bill 409 in its present form because section 8 would grant discretionary authority practically to nullify the provisions of the bill suspending immigration into this country, if the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of State recommended that such a course be adopted. The wording of this section as drafted by the committee is not clear, but it is perfectly obvious that the Secretary of Labor, by reason of the fact that she is the agent for the transmission of petitions for entry, would hold a dominant position in determining the policy to be pursued. It will readily be appreciated that I must oppose the enactment of any legislation with any such delegation of authority to the executive branch of the Government.

In the fifth place, I am compelled to object to the passage of Senate bill 409 because the provision in section 11 relating to the registration of aliens would not apply to some of the very classes of entrants whose registration and definite identification is most vital. To explain my point: During the past few years we have had a large increase in so-called visitors who are given a visitor's permit or temporary visa. These are extendable. In this connection I need but state the fact that such visitors can change their names, take a few simple precautions, and they are forever lost to the authorities. This possibility should be prevented.

Another and significant shortcoming in this provision, as at present drafted in section 11 of S. 409, is that the lack of proof of identity effectively blocks deportation in many cases in which proof of origin is not otherwise obtainable. I suggest that my colleagues read what the Commissioner of Immigra-

tion has to say on page 98 of the report of the Secretary of Labor about the difficulties which have arisen in obtaining visas from the representatives of foreign nations in deportation cases. The Commissioner has only partially stated the case, because he fails to tell us that difficulties of identification, through the absence of any fingerprint registration system, facilitate the repudiation of aliens by the consuls of the nations from which the aliens obviously came.

In other words, foreign countries will not take back aliens whom we desire to deport because of lack of identification which cannot be challenged. If Mme. Perkins, our present Secretary of Labor, had not in 1933 revoked the order, then in force, that all aliens on entering the United States be fingerprinted, we should not today be confronted with this grave problem. I want to emphasize this fact because as the war situation becomes more acute more spies and saboteurs will be entering this country, and we cannot prove definite identification without fingerprints.

Finally, title 3 of Senate bill 409 provides for the admission of 20,000 refugee children from Germany or any territory under the de facto or de jure administration of Germany. The admission of 20,000 refugee children means the entrance of 20,000 potential job seekers, because they will eventually compete with our own boys and girls. Last year 750,000 boys and girls graduated from our high schools and colleges, and only one out of every three of these will be able to obtain work for the next several years; so why add to this burden by admitting more from foreign lands to compete with American youngsters who are vainly seeking employment? It simply is not fair to our own native-born and naturalized citizens. I have heretofore been against the admission of 20,000 refugee children from Germany outside the quota system, as proposed by the Wagner-Rogers resolution, and I shall continue to oppose such a proposal with my utmost vigor as long as I can possibly do so. This proposal has every vice which the Quota Act of 1924 was enacted to abolish.

It is a flagrant example of discriminatory legislation. It puts refugees from one nation in a status wholly different from that of refugees from any other country of the world. Congress passed the Quota Act of 1924 for the specific purpose of ending an extension of favors to any race or nation which had contributed to our population, and for the purpose of ending any discrimination against any nation which may have contributed to our population. I am going to fight this proposal to the very last ditch because I know that the great mass of the American people is emphatically opposed to the admission of any more immigrants into the United States, be they refugees or not refugees.

The Gallup poll on American public opinion is today generally regarded as authoritative. I suggest that Senators examine its figures on this question. Let me say, that definite and positive as it has been in indicating the opposition of the American people, I think its estimate of this opposition is conservative. My recollection is that this poll revealed that more than 87 percent opposed the admission of the 20,000 refugee children. So much for Senate bill 409, as reported.

Mr. President, with full appreciation of, and sympathy with, the humanitarian purposes of the members of the Committee on Immigration of this body, I will, as I have indicated, at the close of my remarks introduce a substitute measure for S. 409 which, in my opinion, will meet every legitimate aspiration of aliens who have heretofore been lawfully admitted; and, at the same time, will relieve the great mass of the American people, who believe in restriction upon immigration, of any anxiety that we will be flooded with foreigners at a time when some 23,000,000 or 24,000,000 people are either in receipt of salaries or relief from the Federal Government.

The measure which I propose involves merely a very minor amendment to section 1 of S. 409 as reported by the Committee on Immigration. The substitute reads as follows:

That upon the enactment of this act, except as hereinafter provided, no immigration visa shall be issued to any alien who is defined as a quota immigrant by the Immigration Act of 1924 and no quota immigrant shall be admitted to the United States for a period of 5 years, except an alien who is the husband, or wife, or the unmarried child of an immigrant who has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided, however, That*

no visa shall be issued to such quota immigrant who has been married to an alien resident of the United States for the purpose of securing admission to the United States, and not for the purpose of continuous cohabitation in good faith as husband or wife: And provided further, That the admission of such quota alien into the United States shall be dependent upon full compliance with every other provision of the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator from Georgia will pardon me, I will yield to him in a moment or two.

Mr. President, it will be noted from the substitute measure, which I propose to introduce, that I have stricken out all the controversial matter embodied in Senate bill 409, as reported by the committee. I have done this in order to get immediate action on the noncontroversial matter in S. 409 as reported by the committee; nevertheless, I hope the committee will restudy my bills:

S. 407. To further reduce immigration, to authorize the exclusion of any alien whose entry into the United States is inimical to the public interest, to prohibit the separation of families through the entry of aliens leaving dependents abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 408. To provide for the national defense by the registration and fingerprinting of aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 409. To protect American labor and stimulate the employment of American citizens on American jobs by restricting immigration for the next 10 years.

S. 410. To provide for the deportation of aliens subsisting on relief under certain circumstances.

S. 411. To provide for the deportation of aliens inimical to the public interest.

In conclusion, I earnestly and respectfully urge upon my colleagues who are members of the Committee on Immigration of the Senate to report promptly the substitute bill in regard to which we can have no difference of opinion, because it merely suspends new immigration of persons who have no claims upon any alien lawfully admitted to the United States. The substitute simply upholds the basic principle of numerical restriction upon immigration into the United States under the quotas, as provided for by the act of 1924, with broad humanitarian consideration for aliens of good standing now in this country.

I now introduce and send to the desk my proposed substitute bill for proper reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3201) prohibiting the issuance of immigration visas to quota immigrants, restricting the admission of aliens, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the able senior Senator from my sister State of Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator a question, because he has obviously made a very careful analysis of the bill reported by the committee to which, I believe, he refers as Senate bill 409.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina if Senate bill 409 in any wise affects or destroys the quota system as established in the act of 1924?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It does, indeed. As a matter of fact, it weakens our immigration laws considerably.

Mr. GEORGE. Does it undertake after the period of 5 years or the limited period during which immigration is cut down to restore a basis other than the quota system?

Mr. REYNOLDS. As a matter of fact, as I have said, it weakens tremendously our present immigration laws in challenging of the seventh proviso. At the present time an alien in this country who has entered legally has the right to bring in under the quota a husband or a wife, as the case may be, or an unmarried child under 21 years of age. If Senate bill 409 were enacted, it would have the effect of putting aliens who arrive illegally in the same status as aliens

in this country who arrived legally, or in the same status as citizens of the country who are entitled to bring in their relatives from abroad.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. Does the bill as reported in any wise affect the national origins theory carried in the act of 1924?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not in any direct particular case. I will say to the Senator that I was extremely anxious to bring about at the last session of the Congress legislation that would provide for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens. I am more interested in doing that now, as are about 80 percent of the American people, for the reason that it has been revealed to us that today our country is honeycombed with saboteurs and spies. For years in this body I have been saying, as the Senator will recall, that we must put some restriction upon the activities of alien visitors, because if ever the time comes when we may be involved in war we will have thousands upon thousands of cases of sabotage and of espionage. No action has been taken; but my position has been vindicated 100 percent, I am happy to say, and my friends in North Carolina are happy to learn.

In that vindication I now desire to pay my respects to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, who advised me officially that prior to 1938 his division of the Department of Justice received only 50 or 70 or perhaps 100 complaints of espionage and sabotage in the United States, but from the time the war was declared at 12 o'clock on September 3, 1939, by France, and at 5 o'clock on September 3, 1939, by Great Britain, up until January 10, 1940, his department received about 5,000 complaints of espionage and sabotage in this country. The appalling thing of interest to Members of the Senate, who are eager to protect American industries and citizens, is that within the past month it was revealed to me by Mr. Hoover that complaints are arriving in his bureau at the rate of 78,000 annually. In other words, prior to the declaration of war by France and Great Britain on September 3, 1939, there were received less than 200 complaints a year. Today, after the declaration of war by Great Britain and France, at a time when we are at peace with the world, there are being received in this country more than 217 complaints every day.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator know how many of these complaints have been investigated by the Bureau to which he refers?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have not been advised as to the number that have been investigated since September 3, but I know that quite a number of cases were investigated prior to that, perhaps 50 or 60.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator know whether any facts were discovered, as a result of whatever investigations were made, which would throw more light on the extent of actual sabotage?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have not that information.

Mr. WALSH. It would be interesting to know if there is any real foundation behind a substantial number of the complaints. Does not the Senator from North Carolina think so?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say that I have addressed a letter to the Director of the Bureau of Investigation making inquiry concerning the point which the Senator raises, because it occurred to me that it would be well that Members of this body be informed as to that, in view of the fact that we have but recently learned that one of our great power dams in the West—I think it was Boulder Dam—is now surrounded by guards of the Department of Justice, and because of other cases of sabotage of which we have read through the columns of the daily press.

In reference to the matter which the Senator has brought to my attention, I desire to say that I was directly advised that as a result of the situation existing at the present time one of the great transportation systems in this country found it necessary to employ 1,000 additional patrolmen to



guard and patrol its lines, at the individual expense of the corporation itself.

Mr. WALSH. I assume, also, that the information presented by the Senator from North Carolina indicates that there is a need of additional investigators.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There is no question about that. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice recently put on, I understand, about 250 additional men; and, of course, if they are to investigate every one of the complaints that arrive there, taking into consideration the fact that 217 such complaints are being received daily, it is going to require a great many more investigators than they have at the present time.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator will pursue his inquiry and find out, if he can, just how much substance or reality there is to these complaints. At a hysterical time like the present, persons are prone to write letters complaining about some neighbor, or somebody else with whom they have had trouble, that are not always reliable.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator that that likewise, has been my experience.

Mr. WALSH. But I should like to find out if we really can determine, and if so, to what degree, upon the exercise of sabotage by citizens or noncitizens of this country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think it would be well to make inquiry as to whether there has been any actual activity of that kind on the part of any persons who reside within the confines of this country, whether they be citizens or noncitizens, whether they arrived legally or illegally, regardless of who they are.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In that connection I desire to say to the Senator that I wish to make myself understood with regard to this matter. When I employ the word "alien" I am speaking of the foreigner who arrived here legally and remains here legally without having made application for citizenship after having been here a number of years, and who is not a citizen. I apply the word "alien" to those who arrived here illegally and remain here illegally, or those who arrived illegally and whose status has been changed, and yet who have not made application for citizenship.

Mr. WALSH. And who show no disposition to become Americanized.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, as the Senator knows, there are some aliens who, by reason of inability to read or write the English language, are unable to be naturalized. I have had, and the Senator undoubtedly has had, some correspondence from such aliens requesting my aid and assistance to find out just what the law is. But the Senator means—and I think all of us are in accord with his view—that we have little sympathy for aliens who have shown no willingness or disposition to become Americanized, and enjoy the privileges of American citizenship, and subject themselves to its laws.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Exactly; and we have less sympathy for the 20,000 alien habitual criminals that the former Commissioner of Immigration said were in this country.

Mr. WALSH. So far as I am concerned, criminal aliens cannot be gotten out of the country quickly enough.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I feel that way about it.

I desire to say that there are in this country today many aliens who are really persons of fine character, and are good neighbors, and will be good citizens when they become citizens of the United States. I desire further to say that some of the best people we have in the United States, some of our best citizens, some of our most worthy characters, are those who have come here and become naturalized; and there is absolutely no distinction between a natural-born citizen and one who has come from foreign shores and become a naturalized American citizen.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator will permit me to make a further statement, I think he will agree with me that we have been deeply impressed, and sometimes deeply thrilled, at the sentiments of appreciation for the enjoyment of American citizenship which many of these former aliens have manifested. I have seen many occasions when their pride in being

Americans, in their realization of what they possess that they never before possessed in their lives, has been most touching, and all this is a great tribute to our institutions and to our country and to the character of these good people.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is a high tribute to the American form of government; and, as a matter of fact, it is an inspiration in itself.

Mr. WALSH. And for the very reason that we have these good former aliens, these good American citizens who appreciate American citizenship, we ought to be all the more alert to protect them against the contamination of those who would undermine our institutions.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely. As a matter of fact, we are just as thoroughly desirous of bringing about segregation for the protection of the foreign-born who come here and want to become a part of our American citizenship as we are enthusiastically interested in providing protection for our own American citizens.

In regard to fingerprinting, the truth about the matter is—and I have heard this opinion expressed by many of my colleagues and innumerable other American citizens—that it would not be a bad plan if every single individual in the United States were fingerprinted. It would be for the protection of the individual himself. Hundreds of thousands of American citizens, being aware of that fact, are annually voluntarily being fingerprinted, and their fingerprints are on file with the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. Down in my State of North Carolina, in the high school at Charlotte, a city of 100,000, I understand that virtually every boy and girl who is a student there has voluntarily submitted to fingerprinting; and I do not see why there should be any objection to it. During the World War every one of the 4,000,000 American soldiers under arms and in uniform was registered. All of our seamen and marines were registered. As a matter of fact, I believe that all the members of the Cabinet and of the present administration have been fingerprinted, and nobody has any objection to it. I think it rather worthy of favorable consideration, if only for the protection of the individual himself in carrying on his daily work. I have hundreds of letters from people suggesting that everybody really ought to be registered.

This is a time when I think we ought to be able to ascertain how many aliens there are in the United States. I do not know how many there are. We really cannot ascertain the number until we have some sort of registration act. Somebody said that we are going to register all the aliens in the United States by way of the instrumentalities provided by the present census force; but an alien illegally in this country certainly is not going to look up the census taker to provide the census taker with his name and information to the effect that he illegally arrived in the country.

I think the American people are entitled to know how many aliens there are in the country. The present Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization says there are in the country, according to their estimate, 3,628,103. That is his estimate.

Mr. MARTIN DIES, chairman of the investigating committee in the House interesting itself in un-American activities, in an interview provided a newspaper questioner in Chicago, said there are 7,000,000 aliens in the United States. Mr. Houghteling, the present Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, says there are 3,628,103. I want to believe both of them. I wish I could believe Mr. Houghteling when he says there are only some 3,600,000. I should hate to think that we have 7,000,000 aliens in the United States, and most of them have jobs, when we have 10,000,000 American citizens out of work.

So we are all interested to know how many jobs are being held by aliens. By that I mean noncitizens, whether they came into the country legally or illegally. The only way ever to do it is to have a registration and fingerprinting act, or certainly a registration act. Then we shall know how many aliens there are in the country, and the question will be settled for all time.

Who knows how many aliens have slipped into the country? We all know that the division of the Labor Department interesting itself in border patrol certainly has not enough men

provided actually and physically to patrol the Canadian border, extending for more than 3,000 miles from the Atlantic across to the Pacific. We know that we have not enough patrolmen to cover the strip of land between the United States and the Republic of Mexico. We know that we have not sufficient patrolmen to guard and watch every little inlet down about Florida, Key West, and the British possessions of Nassau, Bimini, and Bermuda. We have not enough to guard the ports in the Caribbean, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the French island possessions, and the British island possessions. It is a very difficult thing; and nobody knows—I would not undertake to say—how many aliens have illegally come into this country. I would not undertake to say how many aliens are illegally coming into this country every night, but I do say that the American people in the present conditions are entitled to know how many there are in this country. I think we ought to take action to bring about the enactment of a measure such as the one to which I have referred, for we are all interested in the present condition.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, I suggest that there should be some modification of our present immigration law. As the Senator knows, I am the ranking member of the Committee on Immigration, and I have given some attention to the immigration problem; and it is a problem.

I rose to observe, however, that in periods of war—and we are now in such a period—considerable hysteria develops and oftentimes injustice is done to very good people in our midst. We are aroused by statements that there is sabotage or that there is subversive activity when there is really no justification for the statement.

I remember that when the World War broke out I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as I am now, and many complaints came to the committee concerning activities which were alleged to be treasonable, or certainly inimical to the best interests of our country, on the part of persons of foreign birth. We made investigation and found that there was justification for some of the charges, but that many of them were without foundation.

It seems to me that in periods of world disturbance and confusion we should not become hysterical; we should not see substance where there are only shadows, and we should hesitate to brand persons as being guilty of subversive activities unless there is ample and sufficient reason for so doing. It is a serious thing to brand a man as being an enemy to our country when there is no foundation for the charge. I sometimes have felt, as I felt during the early period of the World War, that we were a little too prone to exaggerate conditions, to accentuate small evils, and make of them very serious manifestations of offense against the Government.

I wanted to make this observation in the light of the statement which the Senator from North Carolina has made.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator, because his remark is in line with the suggestion made by the able Senator from Massachusetts, by way of inquiry, when he asked whether or not I had information from the Bureau of Investigation as to the truth or untruth of these statements. I think the Senator's remarks are very pertinent, because at a time like this there is apt to be hysteria, and I do not think anyone should be branded falsely; but it is the duty of our country to be careful and to guard our interests.

Mr. REYNOLDS subsequently said: Mr. President, during the course of my remarks a few moments ago the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] directed an inquiry to me in reference to Senate bill 409, and I am ready to assume as a result of inquiries directed to me a moment ago in the cloak room by some of my colleagues that I evidently did not understand the question of the Senator from Georgia.

If he was referring to the basic quota law, I wish to say in conjunction therewith that I did not intend to convey an erroneous impression, to the effect that Senate bill 409 increases the present world quota; but I intended to convey the impression that in my opinion Senate bill 409 would give a certain class of aliens a preference which they do not have at the present time, and that, as a result of what

I claim to be a misinterpretation of the seventh proviso, of necessity additional aliens are permitted to enter this country with clean slates.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AND NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7805) making supplemental appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments, Coast Guard, and Federal Bureau of Investigation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 8, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Organized Reserves", on page 13, line 24, after the word "headquarters", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

*Provided further,* That the mileage allowance to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when called into active service for training for 30 days or less shall not exceed 4 cents per mile.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Navy Department—Bureau of Engineering—Engineering", on page 17, line 18, after the numerals "1940" to strike out "\$18,818,000" and insert "\$18,363,000", so as to read:

For an additional amount for engineering, comprising the same objects specified under this head in the Navy Department and Naval Service Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, \$18,363,000, of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for the pay of employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Construction and Repair—Construction and Repair", on page 18, line 6, after the numerals "1940", to strike out "\$15,514,000" and insert "\$14,969,000", so as to read:

For an additional amount for construction and repair, comprising the same objects specified under this head in the Navy Department and Naval Service Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, \$14,969,000, of which not to exceed \$145,000 shall be available for the pay of employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedules of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Ordnance—Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy", on page 18, line 17, after the numerals "1940", to strike out "\$31,060,000" and insert "\$30,260,000", so as to read:

For an additional amount for ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, comprising the same objects specified under this head in the Navy Department and Naval Service Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, \$30,260,000, and, in addition, the Secretary of the Navy may enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1940, for the purposes of this appropriation, to an amount not in excess of \$2,450,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Yards and Docks—maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks", on page 21, line 14, after the numerals "1940", to insert a comma and "and including the purchase of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles at a cost not to exceed \$600 each", so as to read:

For an additional amount for maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, comprising the same objects specified under this head in the Navy Department and Naval Service Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, and including the purchase of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles at a cost not to exceed \$600 each, \$871,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Aeronautics—Aviation, Navy", on page 22, line 9, after the numerals "1940", to strike out "\$34,736,000" and insert "\$28,661,000", so as to read:

For an additional amount for aviation, Navy, comprising the same objects specified under this head in the Navy Department and Naval Service Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, \$28,661,000.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—Treasury Department—Coast Guard", on page 28, line 7, after the word "employees", to strike out "\$45,990" and insert "\$43,701", so as to read:

Office of the Commandant: For personal services in the District of Columbia, for temporary employees, \$43,701.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 16, to strike out "\$2,288,000" and insert "\$2,263,000", so as to read:

Pay and allowances: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers, cadets, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired, temporary cooks, surfmen, substitute surfmen, and three civilian instructors, retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service authorized by the act approved April 14, 1930 (14 U. S. C. 178a), and so forth, \$2,263,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 20, to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$250,000", so as to read:

Fuel and water: For fuel, lubricating oil, kerosene, and water, and for the furnishing of heat, light, and power (service) for vessels, stations, and houses of refuge, \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 2, to strike out "\$836,373" and insert "\$700,000", so as to read:

Outfits: For outfits, including necessary supplies and equipment, medals, newspapers and periodicals for statistical purposes, rental of mechanical accounting machinery, repairs to portable equipment at shore units, ship chandlery, engineers' stores, and draft animals and their maintenance, \$700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 14, after the words "In all" to strike out "\$4,340,000" and insert "\$4,126,701", so as to read:

In all, \$4,126,701: *Provided*, That the limitation of \$2,200,000 which may be expended for aviation contained in said Treasury Department Appropriation Act under "Coast Guard" is hereby increased to \$2,435,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 4, to strike out the following section:

SEC. 402. This act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 6, to insert the following:

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
PRICE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

SEC. 501. Not to exceed \$11,000,000 of the funds appropriated by the item entitled "Parity Payments" contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1940, are hereby made available for the purpose of making payments under the Price Adjustment Act of 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 14, to insert the following section:

SEC. 502. This act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7805) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], on the 23d instant, delivered an able and exhaustive address upon the pending bill. He referred to the extensive survey which he had made, and directed attention to the many activities of the War Department and to the very large number of Army posts and stations in continental United States, as well as in some of our territorial possessions. I did not have the privilege of hearing the Senator's address, but this morning I availed myself of the opportunity of reading it, and find myself in agreement with most

of what the Senator has stated, and I am glad that he has presented to the Senate the result of his observations.

I might add that it has been my view that for several years both the Army and the Navy were maintaining too many posts and stations, naval bases, and so forth. When I was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs I made an investigation of our naval posts and stations, yards, bases, and so forth, and recommended the closing of a considerable number and the consolidation of others. I believed, with respect to the Army as well as the Navy, that the administrative expenses were entirely too great and that too many stations, posts, yards and docks, and bases were maintained. I believed that, in the interest of economy as well as efficiency, there should be a reduction in the number of agencies and organizations above referred to.

As stated, I did not have the privilege of hearing the Senator's address and have taken the floor, first, to compliment the Senator upon his exhaustive survey; and, secondly, to refer to a statement which he made with reference to the air base in my State.

The Senator, in his address, stated:

I may state that the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is not now present, although I think he knew I was to mention his State.

First, I confess that I was not present, because I was compelled to attend a meeting of the Temporary National Economic Committee, as the acting chairman. I knew that the Senator was expected to address the Senate, but I did not know that he would refer to the so-called arsenal or air base in my State.

In the course of the address delivered by the Senator, he stated, in substance, that—

There is in the deserts of Utah an arsenal where there are now being loaded shells and bombs for destructive purposes.

And further—

Adjacent to that arsenal on which the Government was spending multiplied millions of dollars in building an airport.

And he asked:

For what purpose?

He further stated:

It is not a commercial airport; there is no town near it; it is on the desert—

And so forth.

The Senator further, after asking what the airport was for, stated:

It embraces thousands of acres of land in the desert near Ogden; that desert land grows nothing save an occasional weed when rains infrequently come. That land, on an average, cost \$47 an acre, although it is worthless for any purpose on earth.

The Senator suggested that the Government could save money by moving—

That would-be arsenal from Ogden, Utah, to some other place and could save money by not spending money in developing that airfield close to Ogden, Utah, and the arsenal there.

I do not rise for the purpose of criticizing my dear friend but believe the able Senator is not fully advised concerning the matter to which he referred.

First, may I say that several years after the World War, when changes were being made in the Army and in Army posts and stations, and the technique of the military department was being modified, the experts and those in charge of our military operations made, as I was advised, an exhaustive survey of the military needs of our country, and after this survey was completed they announced that in the interest of national defense the Government should establish a munitions depot or arsenal in Utah. They contended that the munitions and military supplies to be stored in the munitions plant and arsenal should be remote from the seacoast, and in a region where the climate was dry. Their view was that powder and munitions should be stored in a dry climate and not near the seacoast where, because of dampness, they would deteriorate. I was advised at that time that after a thorough investigation and survey, the most suitable place for the arsenal and munitions plant was at a point a few

miles south of Ogden, Utah. The original plan, as I recall, called for the construction of several buildings and for underground vaults or rooms for the protection of the shells and various kinds of munitions; also for the construction of the necessary railway facilities in order to convey to the buildings, when completed, the necessary munitions and other material and military supplies. The completed structure was to cost several millions of dollars.

An examination of the place selected for the arsenal and the munitions plant will convince the most skeptical that no more suitable place could be found in the intermountain region.

After a considerable sum had been expended in the construction of the plant some changes were made in the general plan submitted by the War Department. The purpose, however, to erect the plant referred to was not abandoned, but because of economies that were incurred, or for other reasons which seemed valid, there was a temporary suspension in the development of the program.

I do not recall the price paid for the land acquired by the Government. As I have indicated, a few miles south of Ogden, on what was known as The Ridge, the necessary acreage was obtained. The land was dry and a considerable portion of that which was acquired by the Government was uncultivated.

It is a historic fact that the intermountain region was regarded as a desert. The rainfall was not great, but, forbidding as the territory was, thousands of patriotic and enterprising Americans entered the valleys of the intermountain region and, by thrift and energy, built great commonwealths and developed a high form of civilization. As many Senators know, Utah was a part of the territory which was ceded to the United States by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. It and surrounding lands were almost terra incognita. Many will recall the great speech of Daniel Webster in which he stated in substance that the lands of the West were valueless, the home of beasts, and unfit for human habitation.

Nevertheless, as I have indicated, brave men and women, who became the pioneers of the West, crossed the Mississippi and went beyond the pales of so-called civilization. The Utah pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley in 1847. They found it a desert—a wilderness—inhabited only by jack rabbits and wolves and scattered bands of Indians. However, they were not deterred by reason of the forbidding conditions, and, with courage and sublime faith, addressed themselves to the building of an American Commonwealth. Their numbers were increased until today there are in Utah more than three-quarters of a million people, and from Utah there have gone forth into surrounding States—Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, and California—many thousands of fine American citizens, who have, in the respective States to which they went, made important contributions to the growth and development of the same.

The territory north of Salt Lake City and between it and Ogden was a desert; that is to say, the land was producing nothing but a little grass and sagebrush. But the entire valley between the two cities has been brought under cultivation, and the valley in which Ogden is situated has a population of perhaps 80,000 or more inhabitants. The desert lands have been irrigated. Great reservoirs have been constructed and the water from the same, by canals, has been carried to thousands of acres of land, which have become valuable and highly productive.

The pioneers of Utah developed the irrigation system which has been carried to other States, and the technique employed by the pioneers in their agricultural activities, has been adopted in surrounding States. Lands which were of but little value became valuable when water was applied thereon for irrigation purposes. In and about Ogden and near the arsenal and munitions plant and air base there are important manufacturing plants. Sugar factories, large canning establishments, and a packing plant of considerable magnitude have been erected. The lands which were of but little value have increased in value because of irrigation.

Ogden City, which, as stated, is but a few miles from the arsenal and munitions plant, is known to all persons who have traveled to any extent throughout the United States and in the West. It is a railroad center, into which lines from east and west and north and south converge. It is one of the most progressive and enterprising cities that can be found in the United States. What it lacks in size, it makes up in energy, enterprise, and industrial and business activities.

With the development of aviation, the Government decided that there should be an important air base established adjoining the arsenal and munitions plant. I have no reason to doubt the wisdom of our military leaders. They decided that there should be an air base in the intermountain section, and they determined that that base should be, as I have indicated, adjoining the munitions and arsenal structures. Upon land which was acquired, as I recall, several years ago, an air base is being constructed. I am repeating when I state that those in charge of our national defense and our military policies believed that there should be an important air base in the intermountain region, and, after a complete survey, they selected the present site, where the air base is being erected, as the most suitable point for its location.

I referred earlier in my remarks to the fact that several years ago the War Department had believed it imperative that a munitions depot and arsenal be constructed in one of the valleys in the intermountain region, where climatic conditions were most suitable, and, as stated, they selected the point south of Ogden for the munitions plant and arsenal. It was therefore logical and proper that the air base should be erected near the arsenal and munitions depot. The lands acquired years ago were ample to meet the requirements of the Government for the air base, and for the munitions depot and arsenal. I accept the views of those in charge of our military plans and operations, and believe that they have acted wisely in their selection of a site for the air base and for the munitions depot and arsenal.

#### CIVIL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS OF LABOR

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have a matter of some importance which I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate. I have a report signed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor investigating violations of the rights of labor under Senate Resolution 266 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, and successive resolutions authorizing additional appropriations. This is a report regarding the refusal of a witness to answer various questions in the hearings held by the subcommittee in San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is presented herewith also an explanatory statement, addressed to the Vice President, and signed by the members of the subcommittee, in which they urge that on the presentation of the report he perform the duty incumbent on his office as set forth in section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to congressional investigations, and to present the statement of facts aforesaid to the appropriate United States attorney.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator, Does this relate to a contempt in San Francisco?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Did the committee take any proceeding against those who were accused of being guilty?

Mr. WALSH. A witness declined to answer questions propounded to him by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and I believe by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], at least by the Senator from Wisconsin, and these proceedings are a result of the refusal to answer questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the action taken now to be Senate action?

Mr. WALSH. No; it is the procedure established by law for the committee to make a report and call the matter to



the attention of the Senate, and ask the Vice President to proceed under the statute dealing with cases of this kind. In other words, he will be expected to refer the matter to the United States attorney for investigation and grand-jury action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that whatever action is taken has to be taken by the Senate? I understood the Senator from Massachusetts merely presented this matter for printing in the RECORD. I would be opposed to taking any action of this kind without knowing further about it.

Mr. WALSH. I asked that the report of the committee be printed in the RECORD, and then I requested that the information in the report be given to the Vice President, for him to take the action which is provided by law in circumstances of this kind, namely, to refer the matter to the appropriate United States attorney for his attention and consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not looked at the law lately, but a witness cannot be in contempt of a subcommittee, or of a committee, until the committee reports that action to the Senate itself and it holds him in contempt, as I understand the procedure.

Mr. WALSH. I do not understand that to be the procedure. The committee must make a report to the Senate, and that is being done, and at the same time the report is being made and a request made to have it printed, the information contained in the report is called to the attention of the Vice President in order that he may proceed under the statute, which directs him to report the matter to the appropriate United States attorney.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the Senator presenting the matter, but I certainly would not want the Senate with my concurrence to take any action to foreclose a case of this kind without further information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the law approved June 22, 1938, the parliamentarian advises the Chair, upon a report coming in the Vice President must furnish the information to the appropriate district attorney, without any action on the part of the Senate; and in order that it may be certain just what the law provides, the Chair directs the clerk to read section 104 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act to which the Chair has called attention.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[Public Resolution No. 123, 75th Cong.; ch. 594, 3d sess.; H. J. Res. 699]

Joint resolution to amend sections 101, 102, 103, 104, and 859 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to congressional investigations

SEC. 104. Whenever a witness summoned as mentioned in section 102 fails to appear to testify or fails to produce any books, papers, records, or documents, as required, or whenever any witness so summoned refuses to answer any question pertinent to the subject under inquiry before either House, or any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or any committee or subcommittee of either House of Congress, and the fact of such failure or failures is reported to either House while Congress is in session, or when Congress is not in session, a statement of fact constituting such failure is reported to and filed with the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, it shall be the duty of the said President of the Senate or Speaker of the House, as the case may be, to certify, and he shall so certify, the statement of facts aforesaid under the seal of the Senate or House, as the case may be, to the appropriate United States attorney, whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the grand jury for its action.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am submitting this report at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], both of whom have been conducting hearings at San Francisco and Los Angeles. The parliamentarian of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the Senate have been consulted, and I suggest that the procedure appears to be in conformity with the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I am not interested in this matter, so far as I know, but the attorney general of the State of California called upon me just before I left San Francisco and asked me to keep him advised of any

actions that were taken in connection with certain cases in which he was asked for his opinion. I do not know whether those cases are involved or not, and I should like to have the matter rest on the presentation which has been made here, and that the request for action be withheld until I have had an opportunity to look at the matter and see whether or not it is embraced within what the attorney general of the State of California requested me to do.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be very glad to withdraw the request for the filing of the report, and let the Senator from California have an opportunity to inspect it and investigate it between now and Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts withdraws his request.

Mr. WALSH. For the time being.

#### IMPORTATION OF INFESTED BULBS

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 143, which now lies on the table. I have consulted with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and they have no objection to the consideration of the resolution at this time. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 143) submitted by Mr. SCHWELLENBACH (for himself and Mr. McNARY) on June 7, 1939, was considered and agreed to as follows:

*Resolved*, That a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee, is authorized and directed to examine the Secretary of Agriculture and Dr. Lee A. Strong, Chief of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, with respect to the following matters:

(1) Why the Department of Agriculture failed to keep the agreement made with the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, acting on behalf of the Senate, on March 17, 1938, providing for the necessary sterilization of the bulbs imported into the United States, which were described in Senate bill 2983, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

(2) Why the Department of Agriculture failed to keep the agreement with individual Members of the Senate, the basis of which is correspondence dated June 13, 1938, and July 5, 1938.

(3) Why, after the Department of Agriculture presented to individual Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and caused to be introduced the bills S. 1364 and H. R. 4036, an adverse report on such legislation was later submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

The subcommittee shall report to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations.

#### AERIAL MOTION-PICTURE EXHIBIT

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns I should like to make an announcement.

Immediately after adjournment there will be a motion-picture exhibit in the District of Columbia Committee room. Motion pictures in colors were made from an airplane, showing from the air all the cities from New Orleans to Minneapolis. Through the courtesy of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], his committee room has been placed at the disposal of the Senate for this purpose; and I think Senators who have the time, and who have never flown in an airplane from New Orleans to Minneapolis, will find the exhibit very interesting.

This invitation also applies to the gentlemen of the press.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations) reported favorably from

that committee the nomination of Lt. Col. Benjamin Marvin Casteel, of Missouri, to be work projects administrator for Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

#### POSTMASTER—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jessie B. Searle to be postmaster at Redrock, Okla., which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I withdraw any further objection to the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Jessie B. Searle to be postmaster at Redrock, Okla., is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the remaining nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate on January 25 (legislative day of January 23), 1940*

##### ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Lewis Compton, of New Jersey, to be The Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

##### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Carroll Miller, of Pennsylvania, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1946. (Reappointment.)

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Theron Lamar Caudle, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, vice Marcus Erwin, deceased.

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. Mr. Summers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 2, 1939.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Julius J. Wichser, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana. He is presently serving in this post under a court appointment.

William F. Burguson, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina. Mr. Burguson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 14, 1938.

Reed Sharp, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee. He is presently serving in this post under a court appointment.

Albert M. Rowe, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia. Mr. Rowe is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 1, 1939.

Charles H. Cox, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia. Mr. Cox is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 18, 1938.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 23), 1940*

##### POSTMASTERS

##### GEORGIA

Arthur S. Boyett, Buena Vista.

##### INDIANA

Gordon E. Faupel, East Gary.

##### MINNESOTA

Barnard C. Heim, Forest Lake.

##### MISSOURI

Francis T. McClure, Alma.  
Ethel Maurine Elliff, Anderson.  
Sidney M. Cramer, Archie.  
Claude M. Reid, Aurora.  
Robert L. Ellis, Ava.  
Nelson H. Mullen, Belton.  
Paul C. Catlett, Birch Tree.  
William H. Ward, Bonne Terre.  
Joe C. Alexander, Branson.  
Fred R. Morrow, Buffalo.  
Mary R. Fewel, Calhoun.  
Emmett O. Griffin, Cartersville.  
Gladys I. Smith, Cassville.  
George K. Spalding, Chesterfield.  
John E. Moore, Clinton.  
James E. Thomson, Craig.  
Vernon D. Washington, Eldorado Springs.  
George T. Barker, Everton.  
Thomas A. McQuary, Galena.  
Robert C. Smith, Garden City.  
Fred G. Lane, Gerald.  
William B. Nivert, Glasgow.  
George L. Chancellor, Goodman.  
Zadok C. Miller, Greentop.  
William L. Klein, Harris.  
Orion J. L. Brookhart, Harrisonville.  
Melissa M. Wilson, Hartville.  
Buren Napper, Holcomb.  
Jessalee Nash, Hollister.  
Eugene H. Randol, Kennett.  
William R. Doss, Kimmswick.  
Allie V. Neil, Leeton.  
Mary G. Ramsey, Lexington.  
Mary L. Castleberry, Libbourn.  
Boyd F. Eversole, Lowry City.  
Robert Irving Caldwell, Lutesville.  
Myrtle Rauls, Marquand.  
George T. Duggins, Marshall.  
William T. McMahan, Marshfield.  
Walter E. Evans, Meadville.  
Maurice D. Cole, Montrose.  
Emma Beardslee, Morley.  
Tom C. Short, Mountain Grove.  
Roy S. Kenney, Neosho.  
James Boulton Settle, New Franklin.  
Sadie E. Burnett, Norwood.  
Elmer E. Gentemann, O'Fallon.  
Joseph Wiley Stivers, Piedmont.  
William H. Bust, Potosi.  
Forest C. Muir, Raytown.  
Herbert L. Weils, Republic.  
Oren Simpson, Richland.  
Helen J. Baysinger, Rolla.  
Anna B. Wood, Rosendale.  
Merl L. Gamble, Sheldon.  
Clyde W. Greenwade, Springfield.  
Azzo B. Grier, Strafford.  
Walter E. Burris, Urbana.  
Jessie B. Smith, Walnut Grove.  
Joseph D. Hawkins, Webb City.  
Earl E. Lamberson, Wheaton.

##### NEW JERSEY

Cecil R. McConnell, Annandale.  
Joseph F. Dempsey, Paulsboro.

##### OHIO

May Ellen Maher, Berea.  
Charles C. Reynolds, Blanchester.  
Franklyn W. Thomas, Bowling Green.  
Raymond C. Ritenour, Cedarville.



Harry M. Walden, Coolville.  
 John Z. Lytle, Fredericksburg.  
 Burl A. Lauderbaugh, Gambier.  
 Frank A. Loomis, Garrettsville.  
 Frederick Higham, Gates Mills.  
 Herbert L. Gray, Gnadenhutten.  
 Bert L. Peer, Groveport.  
 Donovan T. Dickerson, Hopedale.  
 Vanessa E. Campbell, Huron.  
 Calvin S. Prater, Kenton.  
 Charles Stanley Earnhart, Lebanon.  
 Leon E. Gorham, Leroy.  
 Frank G. Brown, Logan.  
 Frank E. Noland, London.  
 William A. Cowen, Loudonville.  
 Hoyt Leiter, Lucas.  
 Dell M. D. Waterman, Madison.  
 Harry F. Mohr, Mechanicsburg.  
 William Alexander, Miamisburg.  
 Lewis Edgar Clawson, Middle Point.  
 David Wilson Sroufe, Mount Orab.  
 Louis J. Eberle, Nelsonville.  
 Katherine H. Baxter, Newcomerstown.  
 George A. Greenbaum, New Lexington.  
 Oscar E. Herring, Oakharbor.  
 Morton A. Houghton, Oberlin.  
 Anna M. Wannemacher, Ottoville.  
 George J. Munger, Perrysburg.  
 Frank F. Wyman, Pioneer.  
 James M. McCrone, Poland.  
 E. Leroy Brown, St. Paris.  
 Earl C. Windle, Sebring.  
 George W. Conroy, Steubenville.  
 Robert C. Boylan, Struthers.  
 Walter J. Pinkstone, Swanton.  
 Walter A. Strapp, Urbana.  
 Charles A. Kempf, West Lafayette.  
 Henry J. Grote, Yellow Springs.

## OKLAHOMA

Jessie B. Searle, Redrock.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Duncan M. Johnston, Alderson.  
 Lillie R. Frazier, Buffalo.  
 George C. Sowards, Hurricane.  
 Clyde E. Knapp, Moundsville.  
 William C. Carter, Mount Hope.  
 Alma C. Smith, Omar.  
 Okey K. Burdette, Point Pleasant.  
 Paul Pickens, Ravenswood.  
 Leroy C. Thrasher, Ronceverte.  
 Lewellen A. Douglas, Spencer.  
 Clitus D. Ashcraft, Wallace.  
 Ann H. Wetherby, Welch.  
 Oma Corder, West Union.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Paul B. Kern, bishop of the Nashville Area, Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

"O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come," be very near unto us and grant us Thy grace and guidance in this present hour. Many difficulties confront us; many problems perplex our minds and hearts. Grant unto us Thy servants a share of Thy wisdom and understanding, and may the deliberations of this body be guided this day by Thy judgments and may they advance the cause of Thy kingdom upon the earth.

We pause to ask Thy blessing upon the family and friends of the fallen comrade of this united body of legislators. And we pray that in that distant city where his tired body is being laid to rest the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ may be suffi-

cient for their every need and they may know that underneath them are the everlasting arms of love and strength.

Guide the nations of this earth toward the pathways of peace; restrain the cruel hand of violence; comfort the oppressed; bring victory to the cause of righteousness. Forgive us our sins and save us from the fallacy of believing that we can work out the good life for ourselves or for others except as Thou shalt govern our minds and direct our paths. This we pray in the name of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation, which was read:

JANUARY 24, 1940.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,  
*Speaker of the House, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Patents to take effect at once.

With kind regards, I am

Very sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief statement by Raymond Gram Swing on the Finnish situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered on the Forum of the Air on December 3 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by L. J. Taber, master of the Grange, on the subject of reciprocal-trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the life and services of two former Members of the Rules Committee, Mr. MAPES, of Michigan, and Mr. TAYLOR, of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the services and life of two gentlemen who entered the House with me in the Sixtieth Congress and who passed away a few days ago, Mr. MARTIN, of Colorado, and Mr. ASHBROOK, of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the services and life of Dr. SIROVICH, of New York, who recently passed away.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

## EXPENSES OF DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 368

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress and continued under House Resolution 26, Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 321, third session, Seventy-sixth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate un-American propaganda in the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, and the amount herein appropriated is to cover all expenditures of said committee of every nature in the final completion of its investigation and filing its report not later than January 3, 1941.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. The head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said special committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, next Monday is the fifth Monday in the month, therefore it is neither unanimous-consent day nor District of Columbia day. I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday to call the omnibus claims bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Judge Panken, of New York, on human rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the Washington News on the subject of the Dies committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short letter on interlocking directorates, and in another extension of my remarks to include a speech on the Far East.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1939

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1940.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—NINETIETH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD CO. FOR FISCAL YEAR 1939

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninetieth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1940.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent magazine article written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8067, with Mr. PATMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the bill just presented is an urgency deficiency bill that contains two principal items which make it necessary to bring in this bill in advance of the regular first deficiency bill. One is an item of \$29,000,000 for the Ordnance Bureau of the Navy Department. The other is an item of \$29,300,000 for refunding internal-revenue collections.

The \$29,000,000 for the Ordnance Bureau is for the payments on armor, armament, ammunition, and guns for something over 100 naval vessels we have under construction. The method of handling this matter is that as this armor plate, guns, and equipment is fabricated and delivered to the Navy Department the Ordnance Bureau pays for it. The current rate of expenditure for this purpose is around \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 a month. On account of industry's getting under way and speeding up to some extent, these deliveries have been made a little faster than had been contemplated, and this accounts for the item of \$29,000,000.

The Budget estimate for it was \$31,000,000. After checking it over very carefully the committee felt that at the present rate of expenditure the \$29,000,000 would run the Bureau for the remainder of the current year.

The item for refund of internal-revenue collections is purely routine. There is nothing we can do about it. These refunds are the regularly adjudicated refunds of tax collections. A deficiency item is necessary for two reasons. One reason is that the Department has been making a greater effort to close up cases and to wind them up without so much delay. Also, as you know, we pay interest on these refunds whenever we pay them, and it is estimated now that it will run \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000 a month on these refunds if we wait for the next deficiency bill.

In this bill also are items for the widows of deceased Members, with the exception of the late gentleman from New York, Mr. Sirovich. The committee had to get some information about his dependents before including that item, and it will come in the first deficiency bill.

There is an item of \$25,000 for the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. This is for the purpose of purchasing typewriters and typewriter desks for the Members due to the fact that an additional clerk was given each Member. The original estimate for this item was \$50,000, and this estimate was sent to the committee in the last session. The committee felt that an effort should be made to get along



without any expenditure for that purpose, if possible. The Clerk made that effort but was not able to do it. We were able, however, to cut the item in half, and we bring it in now as a \$25,000 item.

In the bill is also a small item changing the appropriation for the United States Constitutional Sesquicentennial Commission. This does not in any way affect the amount appropriated but merely allows a small additional amount to be used for clerical help.

In the bill also is an item which I hope will not be unduly offensive to the Members, as it provides them with stationery for this session of Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I direct the attention of the gentleman to the last paragraph on page 2 of the report. I have not had an opportunity to read the hearings on this matter. I wish the gentleman would briefly explain that proposal regarding additional money for the subsidy for exportation of cotton. I wonder how much of the \$113,000,000 remains unexpended.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is nothing in this bill for that.

Mr. MAHON. I know there is nothing in the bill for it, but how much of the \$113,000,000 remains?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. On that point I shall have to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if he is here, or to someone who has the cotton figures. I do not know. I may say to the gentleman, however, that it was stated that they lack between \$9,000,000 and \$11,000,000 of having enough to pay the parity. The suggestion was made that the amount be taken out of the 1940 parity payments. Such a resolution was reported out of the committee. It is not in this bill, however. It has also been added to the defense bill in the Senate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I understand the cotton item that was allotted was \$14,000,000. I obtained this information from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. They have currently spent \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 of that \$14,000,000. I think that is correct. That is only a recollection, however.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for \$29,000,000, approximately, for internal-revenue tax refunds, all of which will be required, according to the testimony of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, by the end of the current fiscal year.

It also calls for \$29,000,000 to cover payments that will be required to be made on ships that have already been laid down by the Navy pursuant to law.

The other items in the bill relating to the administration of the House are small and routine.

The item for arms, armament, and ammunition in the Navy is entirely in connection with the new ships, and there is nothing for laying down anything new. At the rate the money is being spent, this amount will be required by the end of the current fiscal year. They will be practically out of money by the 10th of February. The committee made a cut here of \$2,000,000, because it believed that, according to current rates of expenditure, they would be able to get along all right on that amount; but I do not believe a greater cut would be justified from the evidence.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to inquire whether the gentleman took into consideration the fact that the armament, armor, and ammunition makers are working to full capacity; and if that is true, there would be some question as to whether or not an additional Navy expansion program could be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Of course, we could not adopt a new expansion program. I think that all of these outfits are practically

working to capacity. However, the expenditures in the last couple of months have not been so great as they were in the earlier months of the fiscal year. They seem to be dropping off rather than rising.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I notice an expression is used here, "replacement of naval vessels." Does that mean that this is work on the replacement of some of these ships?

Mr. TABER. It means ships that take the place of something else in the Navy that is already there. For instance, under the law, the way it stands now, a battleship is given a certain age, and when that age comes it is permissible to lay down, provided sufficient funds are available, a new battleship. A replacement program is that type of program rather than an increase in number of ships.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have been requested by Mr. Theodore H. Hoffmann, national chairman of the Steuben Society of America, composed of American citizens of German origin, all of whom are highly patriotic and believe in our representative and constitutional system of government, to place in the RECORD a certain resolution passed by that organization:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the national political committee of the Steuben Society of America:

"If it were at all possible to remove all of the Finns to America in a body this country would in all respects be the gainer. Like the Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, in short, all Scandinavians, who have come to these shores in the past, they would add their numbers to those of our best citizens.

"Dr. Paul Rohrbach, writing for the Staats-Herald, points out that there are no illiterates among the Finns. In Helsinki, a city of 300,000 inhabitants, there are more bookdealers than in any city of its size elsewhere. To purchase and read books is common with the Finn. Newspapers and books are found wherever the traveler goes, in the farthest village and hamlet in the Arctic regions.

"What stuff these people are made of is now being shown by their self-sacrificing fight in defense of their culture and homes.

"Americans divide on many problems, but think and feel as one in behalf of the gallant Finnish people.

"We express our sympathy with the Finnish people in their valiant struggle against Soviet imperialism, which, following in the footsteps of British and French imperialism, is applying the methods of the gangster to seize at the muzzle of the gun whatever it may desire to wrest from a weaker nation."

We would esteem it a favor if you can have this presented to the House of Representatives and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in anticipation of this favor, we beg to remain,  
Very sincerely yours,

THEODORE H. HOFFMANN.

I have another letter addressed to me, making somewhat the same request from the secretary of this organization. I have to confess I do not agree with that part of the letter which favors retaining our Ambassador at Moscow.

Our society wishes to go on record as favoring the retention of Lawrence A. Steinhardt, United States Ambassador to Russia, at his post rather than recall him in protest against the Soviet invasion of Finland, and we also favor the full resumption of diplomatic relations with Germany.

We agree with the statement issued by a number of peace organizations, among them being the Keep America Out of War Congress, World Peaceway, American Friends Service Committee, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, that such a course be taken and support the reasons underlying their recommendation that—

"A period of strained relations is precisely the time when the best possible representation is necessary in the respective capitals of nations between whom differences have arisen."

We would esteem it a favor if you would have this presented to the House of Representatives and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in anticipation of this favor, we beg to remain,  
Very sincerely yours,

F. W. MAYER, Secretary.

As I have stated previously, I am in favor of recalling our American Ambassador from Moscow and severing all diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. This may seem somewhat inconsistent, but, on the other hand, I think one of the greatest mistakes and blunders made by this administration was not the recalling of our Ambassador from Germany a year ago last September—that, I agreed at the time, was a

moral protest against the persecution of certain groups of people in Germany—but I think our Ambassador should have been sent back when the French and British Ambassadors were returned to Germany last spring. It was a disastrous diplomatic blunder. Our Ambassador, Mr. Hugh Wilson, should have been there last August, when the peace of Europe hung in the balance, and our influence could have been used to maintain peace at that time. I am in favor of returning our Ambassador to Germany immediately, so that he can use his influence and represent our country in trying to bring back peaceful relations again in Europe.

Our chargé d'affaires, Mr. Alexander Kirk, an able and experienced diplomat, told me exactly the same thing last summer at Berlin, that we should have an American Ambassador there because he is unable to meet Von Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Minister, and consequently, we do not have the influence we are entitled to with the German foreign office and exert very little influence in helping to restore peaceful relations in Europe.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he thought the presence of an American Ambassador in Germany in last August would have had the slightest effect on the course of events.

Mr. FISH. I will say to the gentleman I hope that an American Ambassador, representing the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world, will always have a great deal of influence in any capital in which he is located, in behalf of peace and the settlement of international dispute by arbitration, mediation, and peaceful methods.

Mr. EATON. How about Russia?

Mr. FISH. I do not claim our Ambassador could have positively prevented the war, but certainly it was our duty to try in every way we could to exercise our influence to prevent the European War before it broke out, and to stop it now.

I may seem inconsistent in saying I do not want an American Ambassador at Moscow, but I regard Soviet Russia as an unfriendly country and opposed recognition on that ground. I am still opposed to recognition which I believe had helped to open the floodgates of Communist propaganda in the United States, and I am against that type of foreign propaganda.

Mr. EATON. I cannot head the gentleman off in anything he has to say against Russia. I say "Amen" to that, but if the gentleman himself could not get peace while he was over there, how does he expect the Ambassador to do it? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FISH. I did my best to do it, and I promise the gentleman and the Congress that I will continue, as long as I am in Congress, to try to restore peaceful relations in Europe, and to end this war, because if it continues the only victor will be Communism and the spread of Communism throughout all of Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. The gentleman from New York is always consistent in his criticism of anything the present administration does. That is one thing upon which he can be accorded entire consistency. But when he says he endorses the withdrawing of our Ambassador to Germany for moral suasion or moral reason, and then thinks he ought to be sent back when conditions in that country have not changed, I doubt if I would debate with the gentleman upon that, except that I do not see that the conditions have changed. But in insisting that we return an Ambassador to Germany, a country whose government certainly I do not endorse, and severing diplomatic relations with Russia, it seems to me the gentleman reaches the point of highest inconsistency. Incidentally we still have our diplomatic relations with Germany, because our Embassy is open.

I think as little of the Russian Government and the people who are in control of it as anybody in the world. I doubt

if the Russian Government, as it is presently constituted, is enjoying having an American Ambassador in Moscow. I rather think we would play into their hands if we severed diplomatic relations. We have a listening post in Russia at least, and I am in favor of keeping it there. I cannot understand why it would help the United States one particle to sever diplomatic relations with Russia. We would have no way on earth of knowing about anything that went on in Russia. Let me repeat, being as much opposed to Communism as one could be, regretting the kind of government under which the Russian people must live, I do not think it is the part of diplomacy on the part of the United States to say, "We will not send an ambassador to a country, we will not retain an ambassador in a country, if we do not endorse the form of government they have."

Now, if we are going out to police the world in its policy and try to change the governments all over the earth that we do not endorse, then, of course, we can go into this kind of—well, I will not say "nonsense," but I can hardly think of a more fitting word to apply to it. We still have diplomatic relations with Germany.

Our Ambassador is not there, but the Embassy is still open. We still have diplomatic relations with Russia. We are informed of conditions in Russia, because we have an ambassador over there. As far as I am concerned, I cannot see how it would help the United States Government one iota to withdraw its Ambassador from Russia and sever diplomatic relations with Russia or anything of the sort, and as far as I am individually concerned—and I am speaking for myself alone—I am utterly opposed to any such procedure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; I yield if I have time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman kindly explain to the House why we should have an Ambassador in Moscow and not one in Berlin?

Mr. RAYBURN. I cannot, but others in positions of responsibility in such matters may have good reasons.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to answer that question, if I may.

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The reason we do not have an Ambassador in Berlin is that at one time they brought the Ambassador from Berlin over to this country and have kept him here ever since. Now, what has happened ever since in Berlin? There is a chargé d'affaires in Berlin, who today is taking care of the affairs of this Government which were formerly taken care of by two Ambassadors and two Ministers, namely, the Ambassador in Berlin, the Ambassador in Poland, the Minister in Austria, and the Minister in Czechoslovakia. But by not sending the Ambassador back to Berlin, this country is at a disadvantage, because the chargé d'affaires cannot deal with the chiefs of state. He must go to people of his rank. As the majority leader has stated, if you withdraw your Ambassador from Moscow today, that is different from sending an ambassador there or opening diplomatic relations, but if you withdraw your Ambassador from Moscow today, there is no way by which the United States can receive information which it is most necessary at this time for them to receive.

We had the same opportunity to withdraw our Ambassador from Japan when incidents occurred there, but we did not, and it would be a most serious matter at this time under conditions that exist in Europe for the United States Government to withdraw its Ambassador from any country in Europe.

Finland would in no way be strengthened if relations with the Soviet Government were to be broken off at this time, and the advocates of severance of relations with Soviet Russia who believe that such an act would help Finland are ill-advised. The President, as you know, during last December, in most forceful terms, gave expression of the attitude of the Government and the people of this country toward the invasion of



Finland by the Soviet Army. The President on that occasion issued the following statement:

The news of the Soviet naval and military bombings within Finnish territory has come as a profound shock to the Government and people of the United States. Despite efforts made to solve the dispute by peaceful methods, to which no reasonable objection could be offered, one power has chosen to resort to force of arms. It is tragic to see the policy of force spreading, and to realize that wanton disregard for law is still on the march. All peace-loving peoples in those nations that are still hoping for the continuance of relations throughout the world on the basis of law and order will unanimously condemn this new resort to military force as the arbiter of international differences.

It would be poor policy, indeed, to establish the principle that the maintenance of diplomatic relations with another government implies approval of the form of government of that country, or of the actions and policies of the government of that country. If that were the case, it would appear to be necessary to consider the advisability of discontinuing diplomatic relations with several other governments now pursuing policies and objectives which the Government and the people of the United States do not approve.

It is more necessary to have diplomatic relations with a foreign country during tense periods than it is in times of international harmony. This is particularly true under the conditions which exist today. In fact, the presence of ambassadors or ministers becomes more essential in these times for the protection of American citizens and property. It must be remembered, furthermore, that no other country has broken off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia during this critical period. The British and the French Governments have not broken off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and have not withdrawn their ambassadors from Moscow.

It should be the policy of the United States to maintain peaceful relations with all countries throughout the world, and the breaking off of relations with Russia would not be in conformity with our policy to maintain such peaceful relations, because you must remember that when diplomatic relations are severed between other countries and the United States, we lose the opportunity to discuss and deal directly on questions that may arise. In this way the absence of official representatives in the capitals of other countries might lead to very unpleasant incidents. The President should always be in the position, should the occasion present itself, to be of assistance in furthering the aims of peace.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not have control of the time.

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. FISH. After what the gentleman has said, I should think he would be very much in favor of sending an American Ambassador back to Berlin.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not say that I would agree to that, for the reason that a mistake was made by asking our Ambassador to come home and leaving a chargé d'affaires there. We have two very fine representatives there, Mr. Kirk and Mr. Patterson. If, however, we should send an ambassador back to Berlin and Berlin did not send an ambassador here, the United States would be placed in a most embarrassing position. We made a mistake there, but let us not repeat the mistake in Moscow or other countries.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, namely:

#### LEGISLATIVE

##### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

To pay the widow of William A. Ashbrook, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of Chester C. Bolton, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of Edward W. Curley, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of George H. Heinke, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of Santiago Iglesias, late a Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of Carl E. Mapes, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of John A. Martin, late a Representative from the State of Colorado, \$10,000.

To pay the daughter of Wallace E. Pierce, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

To pay the widow of J. Will Taylor, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, \$10,000.

The foregoing sums to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

Contingent expenses: For furniture and materials for repairs of same, exclusive of labor, tools, and machinery, for furniture and repair shops, fiscal year 1940, \$10,000.

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of salaries unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, including the same objects specified under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1940, fiscal year 1940, \$15,000.

For stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, \$87,600.

#### EXECUTIVE

##### INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS

##### UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The portion of the appropriation for the Commission, contained in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, which may be expended exclusively for personal services, is hereby increased from \$5,000 to \$7,500.

#### NAVY DEPARTMENT

##### REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

Armor, armament, and ammunition: For an additional amount toward the armor, armament, and ammunition for vessels heretofore authorized (and appropriated for in part), including the same objects and under the same conditions and limitations prescribed under this head in the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1940, \$29,000,000, to continue available until expended.

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT

##### BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Refunding internal-revenue collections: For an additional amount for refunding internal-revenue collections, as provided by law, including the same objects and under the same conditions and limitations prescribed under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1940, fiscal year 1940, \$29,300,000.

Sec. 2. This act may be cited as the "Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940".

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PATMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8067, the first deficiency bill, 1940, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein certain matter and a letter from the Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8068) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue for 2 hours this afternoon, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself, at the end of which time the bill shall be read for amendment. Is this agreeable to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. I should think that would be all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8068, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. HOBBS in the chair.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the development of aviation in this Republic is one of the strongest indications of a progressive people. We are developing aviation from the standpoint of extending its benefits to the users of air mail, to the users of air express, to the individuals who patronize the air transports, and to the ever-growing private flying public. The Civil Aeronautics Authority is doing a splendid work to increase air travel and safety, coupled with needed supervision.

#### REAL SERVICE IS GIVEN

I congratulate the committee that brings this appropriation bill before us for continuing the program which is being carried forth by the Post Office Department in the experimental service which is now in effect in four States, namely, Delaware, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, in extending to the smaller or rural communities of this Nation the benefits of air-mail service. This has been brought about through the use of the automatic pick-up and delivery device which enables the plane carrying the mail to deposit that cargo and at the same time pick up another load of mail from any designated spot, the operation being performed by the plane while in flight and traveling at the rate of between 90 and 125 miles an hour. Ground equipment is simple in construction and operation. Two upright poles, each about 40 feet high, are set into concrete blocks 60 feet apart. A line connects the poles. The mail bag picked up is fastened to the center and held in a special plywood container.

At the present there are 58 communities in these 4 States, with a majority of the communities being in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, which are giving to the country a proving ground for what I believe will be one of the most noteworthy advancements in aviation that this country has seen. I feel that it might be interesting to the membership to know that the trunk lines serving the major cities in this country estimate that they stop their planes in cities approximately 150, 250, and sometimes 700 miles apart, whereas, through the service given by these experimental routes serving these smaller communities, 5, 10, 15, and 20 miles apart. There are 4,000 cities in this land with a population of over 5,000. Today only 210 cities, excluding the 58 pick-up towns, are served with air mail. There are 900 such cities that have airports constructed, but no air-mail service. I think it will be interesting and gratifying to watch in the coming months the further effectiveness of this device as a means of bringing the advantages of air mail not alone to these cities where the service is now being carried forward successfully, but I believe in the next few years it will be enlarged to serve 15, 20, or 25 States of the Union.

#### NO AIRPORT IS NEEDED

There are Members here who come from the mountainous districts where it is impossible to build airports, even if the communities in connection with the Federal Government had the funds; this automatic pick-up and delivery service can bring to those communities desired air-mail service, and soon perhaps a combination of passenger carrying with mail and express, using equipment suitable for smaller airports. The feeder service is surely coming.

I again congratulate the committee, working with the Post Office Department, in continuing this program, and I trust it will not be long until certificates of public convenience and necessity may be given by the Civil Aeronautics Authority so that this worth-while service may be considerably extended. I do not want to draw special attention of the Members to any material I have written. However, I have been intensely interested in this subject for many, many years and have today placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article recently written by myself which fully explains the progress that has been made. Information contained therein may be of interest.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute to make an observation.

Mr. Chairman, I think the country is indebted to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], one of the best friends of aviation in this country, for his very great interest in this subject and for the encouragement and stimulation which he has given to the experiment. I believe it is going to produce something worth while in our postal service in time to come. History will record that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is the father of the pick-up and delivery service.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I say in answer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] that I deeply appreciate his gracious remarks. I have only cooperated with those who have believed in this service. Credit goes to the committee that handled the legislation and to the Members of this body who supported the necessary appropriations. In coming years no Member of this body will regret his support of the air-mail pick-up and delivery program, which I believe will extend its benefits to the people of America in a very short time. I again thank my friend from Indiana.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the colloquy that we had earlier in the morning with reference to international affairs was a most interesting one. I was very happy that our distinguished majority leader took part in that colloquy.

I have great respect for the ability of our distinguished majority leader, and I am very fond of him. Usually his opinions and advice are sound. He struck a very forceful note this morning when he used the word "nonsense." I liked that word "nonsense." You will recall that he used that in connection with the reference which he made to policing the world. It is gratifying to have a distinguished majority leader such as we have, who has his feet on the ground, and I compliment him in the use of that word "nonsense," as some of us recall other phrases which have had authoritative background in connection with the position of the United States in world affairs.

Mr. Chairman, some of us cannot help but recall, for instance, that it has not been long since the word "quarantine" was a rather pertinent phrase and that the suggestion was made not only that we should police the world but that we should quarantine the world. It seems to me, if my memory serves me well, that the suggestion was made at another time that our frontier might be somewhere in France; in fact, I believe it was brought down to an exactness that it might be on the Rhine.

We are to be congratulated that the majority leader has his feet on the ground, that he does not endorse either the quarantining of nations or the frontiers in France, but that he refers so aptly, and, oh, with such forthrightness and forcefulness to the policy of policing the world as nonsense. We of the minority join with him in saying that we hope at all times his sound judgment, his deliberate thought, and his careful analysis may be a guiding force in these troublesome times in determining what America's position is to be in world affairs. [Applause.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### ENORMOUS GOLD SUPPLY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the daily statement of the United States Treasury for January 22, 1940, which discloses that we have in gold—and I presume that all of it is buried in the mountain over at Fort Knox, Ky.—the enormous sum of \$17,842,210,073.36.

#### MONEY AND MONOPOLY

The question arises as to what we should do with that gold. To my mind, this administration has dealt with every major problem except two. I do not believe that we have in a satisfactory way dealt with two major fundamental problems: One is a national monetary system, which would involve this gold, and the other is monopoly.

In regard to this gold we are all familiar with the law that 40 cents in gold is sufficient as a reserve for the issuance of



\$1 in currency or credit—either credit money or actual money. We have always been told by the most conservative bankers and economists in America and in the world that a 40-percent gold reserve is always ample. In fact, England remained on the gold standard for 100 years with no more than a 10-percent gold reserve. So we are safe in assuming that 40-percent gold is certainly a sufficient amount.

If the administration had better control of this gold, our Nation could in a more satisfactory way deal not only with its Budget but with the national debt. We are paying this year \$1,100,000,000 interest on Government securities. I say to you it is absolutely foolish and wrong for the Government to pay interest on its own credit. It is not right. In fact, I will go further and say it is imbecilic for the Government to pay interest for the use of its own credit. Farmers and the unemployed are forced to take drastic cuts in appropriations, but no cuts for the bondholders.

#### GOVERNMENT SHOULD OWN THE 12 FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

The way I have in mind to handle this gold is for the Government to take over the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Many people believe that the Federal Reserve banks belong to our Government now, but they do not. Our Government does not own one penny of stock in these banks. Originally it was contemplated that the Government would own some of this stock, but it has not so far acquired any. The stock in these banks only amounts to \$132,000,000, and it is owned by the private banks of the country. This forces us into the very odd situation of having the private banks of this country owning the bank of issue—the Federal Reserve banks—that use the Nation's credit absolutely without charge to promote their own interests. That is a situation we should not be in.

If the Government would pay the private banks the \$132,000,000 for this stock, the Government would own lock, stock, and barrel the entire Federal Reserve Banking System and this would remove the cloud from the title to this gold. There is more than enough money in the surplus of the 12 banks to pay the \$132,000,000 so the Government would not actually be out a penny.

#### GOVERNMENT CAN SAVE \$1,000,000,000 A YEAR IN INTEREST

There is no reason why anyone should have a cloud on the title of this gold, and that would remove it. This \$17,842,000,000 gold base is a sufficient amount to pay off the entire national debt of this country. I think it could be done, not quickly, not hurriedly, but eventually. If we will take over the 12 Federal Reserve banks and own them as the Government should, we can gradually acquire the entire national debt and save \$1,100,000,000 a year in interest. It is wrong for the Government to pay interest on its own credit, absolutely wrong, and it is not justified. I believe that is the best way to handle the gold situation.

#### GOOD PRICES AND GOOD WAGES

I think some people fail to consider the effect of money upon our entire economic life. I believe in order to have a prosperous country we must have good prices and good wages. There is only one way we can assure ourselves that we will have those two necessary things, and that is by having an ample supply of money and credit.

The demand deposits in the banks really represent the money of this country, not the actual bills or the silver. The bills and the silver represent only about 5 percent of the money in this Nation. The demand deposits in the banks represent our money. I know it is pencil-mark money, I know it does not actually exist, that it is a fiction, but nevertheless it is used just as well and just as effectively as actual money.

#### PER CAPITA MONEY BY STATES

If you will take the demand deposits in banks and divide them by States you will discover that the per capital deposits run all the way from \$500 plus in New York down to below \$30 in Mississippi and South Carolina; in other words, there are States in this Union that do not have more than \$25 per capita money in circulation in their States. If you will then consider the purchases made by people, food, apparel, general merchandise, and building materials, and other durable goods, also luxuries such as jewelry, you will discover that the

amount of these necessities and luxuries of life that are purchased by the people in these States has a direct relationship to the amount of money and credit that is available in these States. In a State where there is \$300 to \$400 per capita in circulation the people purchase more food, more clothing, more general merchandise, and more building materials, and even more jewelry than they do in a State having one-half of that amount.

Knowing this to be true, and knowing that our standard of living is determined largely by the amount of available credit, we should do something to give the people a necessary and sufficient circulating medium, and I believe the way to do it is through the ownership of the Federal Reserve Banks.

#### BLANKET MORTGAGES

It was never intended that the private banking institutions of this country should have the privilege of issuing blanket mortgages against the property of our citizens, a blanket mortgage against everything we own, and charging us interest for creating a mortgage upon our own property. It is not right, it is idiotic; and certainly the time will come one of these days in this country when this system will be changed.

I think the result of this change would be that we would have better prices for farmers. I believe it is necessary to bring back the farmer's purchasing power. I am sorry that more of the city Members do not realize more than they do the necessity for bringing back the buying power of the American farmer. Many of them realize it and they vote with the farmers all time time, not necessarily to help the farmers but to help themselves. Members who live in New York City and Boston and other places realize that we must help the farmer in order to have a market for the goods they manufacture. The last time we had under consideration in the House the question of parity payments, we won by a majority of eight, a very close vote. I want to appeal to the city Members to consider that question and consider the great weight it will have on the future prosperity of this country.

#### ORGANIZED CHARITIES IN CITIES

I know some question came up about relief and there was a difference of opinion among the Members about relief, but let me invite the attention of my good friends from the city to the fact that it will not help you to deprive the farmers of a decent standard of living, it will hurt you.

In this country today we have organized charities in the cities. The people are not going to starve in the cities, and the people of this Nation know it. When people who live in the country districts where they do not have organized charities get in distress and are turned off their farms they are eventually going to drift into the cities, and you will have that additional problem. You can provide for these people much better by keeping them on the land where they really want to live. It is in their interest; it is in the interest of the cities, and it is in the interest of this Nation that you do so. There is only one way you can keep them at home, and that is by giving them an opportunity to earn a livelihood for themselves and their families. It will take money, but not as much as it will take if they are forced to go on relief in the cities.

The saddest day the people of the cities will see in this country will be when all benefits are cut off from the farmers, because there is only one place for them to go, and that is to the nearest city where there is organized charity; and they will go from that city to a larger city, and then drift into Washington, New York, and Chicago, the largest cities of this country. So it is in the interest of the Members who reside in the cities to do something toward helping the farmers stay on the land, and helping them to make a living. All they are asking for is an opportunity to work and earn a sufficient amount to provide themselves with a decent standard of living.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. In my opinion, the gentleman is making a scholarly address. I hope every Member of the House reads it, and digests it very carefully. I believe the gentleman is absolutely correct with reference to the farmers. With 33,000,000 people in this country living on farms, we cannot hope

to have any semblance of prosperity unless the farm is prosperous.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for what he has said. He is exactly right about prosperity of the Nation depending upon the prosperity of the farmers.

#### MONOPOLY

Now, in regard to monopoly, the other problem, I think, is a serious one. The Federal Trade Commission has recently finished an inquiry into the motor-vehicle industry. This report, made by the Federal Trade Commission, is astounding; it is startling. It discloses that if one concern, General Motors, were to withdraw permission from competing manufacturers to use General Motors parts and patents, no automobile in America could be made—not one—not even by the Ford Motor Co., as they are made today. They are absolutely dependent upon that one concern for its parts and patents to make the cars that they are making and delivering at this time. You know that is too much of a monopolistic grip for one concern to have upon the automobile industry of this country, and it is not only in the automobile industry; it is in other lines of business, and it all comes back to the question of concentration of wealth in the hands of a few people.

#### SHARE PRIVILEGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The people of this country are not asking for a division of wealth or to share the wealth. They are not asking for that, but they are asking for sharing the privileges and opportunities, giving them an opportunity to work and earn a livelihood for themselves and their families, and the people all over the Nation cannot do this if we permit a few people in one city to acquire all the privileges and opportunities and have all the money concentrated there.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. If we continue to allow a few people to drain the wealth of the country into one section, we are going to harm the country more. We thought when the Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913 that that would cause a distribution of credit and money, but it has not caused a distribution of credit and money, and during the past 12 months there has been the greatest concentration of money into the hands of a few people, who own a few banks in one city, that has ever existed in the history of the entire Nation.

Did you know that 24 banks own one-third of the banking resources of the 15,000 banks in America? Well, that condition exists and a few men who are directors in those few banks have interlocking relationships with the large corporations which enable them to control 58 percent of the corporate wealth of the entire Nation.

Shall we permit this concentration to continue on as we have in the past and encourage and cause one State to have \$500 of per capita demand deposits, another \$400, and another \$300, while in other sections of the country where they actually produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe all the people of this country, they only have \$20 or \$25 per capita demand deposits, which represents the money or the circulating medium? That is an unequal situation; it is a situation that is not equitable and it is one that must be adjusted.

You take the book that was written by Dr. Webb, of Texas State University, *Divided We Stand*; that book discloses that a few concerns are draining the wealth from the South and from the West and other sections to northeastern centers, and by reason of that concentration these per capita demand deposits go up, but the per capita deposits in the towns and States where this wealth is drained from go down, which, of course, reduces the standard of living of the people in those sections in proportion. This situation will in the end harm the section of the country obtaining control of more than its part of such deposits.

I want to plead with the Members from the cities to give this question consideration. You cannot afford to fail to give the American farmer an opportunity to work for and earn a decent standard of living, and before this session is over I hope that we make adequate appropriations for the farmer,

not only to pay him, but to give him adequate purchasing power to help people in other classes and groups and in all sections of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH].

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chairman, on the subject of appropriations for the Post Office Department there is one postal item to which I wish to direct the attention of the Members of the House. This item is that paragraph reading:

Not more than three-fourths of the funds herein appropriated for the purchase of twine shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from materials or commodities outside the United States.

This paragraph was inserted into the Post Office Department appropriation measure, passed by the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress and is continued as a furtherance of the experiment in this present bill.

We have been told by the gentleman from Indiana that the use of cotton twine has proven itself equally serviceable with that of jute twine in this field. I say to you that this is a fallacy, for it has been brought to my attention by post-office employees in my home district that cotton twine stretches and, therefore, is not quite safe in tying up packages, and it also, in the course of stretching, cuts the hands of those using it. Thus, we may see that cotton twine is detrimental in two distinct ways.

It is true enough that we were shown on the floor of the House at the time this paragraph was first inserted into the post-offices' appropriations measure a new cotton twine guaranteed neither to stretch nor to cut the hands of the employees who used it. Yet each time the Post Office Department, in 1939, asked for bids on the new type of cotton twine on the basis of which this proviso was inserted, not a single bid was received. In fact, on each of the seven bids the postal authorities asked during the year 1939 for cotton twine on only three occasions were bids on cotton forthcoming. And all of these three were bids on the old-type cotton twine, which is the stretching, cutting kind.

Far more important than this, I say to you, is the fact that just such legislation as this is running the cost of our Government far above normal. This proviso caused the buying last year of 360,000,000 yards of cotton twine by the postal authorities, and this cotton twine cost the Government 159 percent more per million yards than did jute twine. This meant, in actual figures, an added expenditure of \$35,000 to the Post Office Department, a sum which was spent needlessly and might have been saved with the continued use of jute twine.

Some of you may say that the purpose of this purchase of cotton twine was to aid American industry. I say to you that I am sincere in my beliefs that our first thought is for American-grown and American-made products, and I will fight to see any wholly American product given preference over that of foreign competition. But such is not the case with cotton twine. The purchase of the 360,000,000 yards of cotton twine by the postal authorities at the added cost of \$35,000 showed no appreciable benefit to our cotton growers or cotton manufacturers. This amount of twine, figured in bales, would reach to about 720 bales net. Out of a 13,000,000-bale crop, this amounts to five one-thousandths of 1 percent. I fail to see where this small figure has done the cotton industry any great amount of good. At this figure the cost of using each bale was approximately \$48, or almost the equal of its value. This only serves to further illustrate that under these conditions it is an unsound economic policy to substitute cotton twine for the more serviceable jute twine used heretofore by the postal employees.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERLACH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Is it not true that they did ask for two bids this year on jute?

Mr. GERLACH. That is correct. I called the Post Office Department Purchasing Agent and he told me that formerly they had always asked for one bid, but because of the proviso inserted at the last session of Congress, they were unable to receive bids on this new twine which the gentleman from



Georgia [Mr. PACE] presented on the floor of this House and for which there were no bids received. The proviso was that they should buy 25 percent cotton twine, and they were forced to ask for these additional bids. I questioned him with reference to the asking for these additional bids.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERLACH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I understood there had been two bids invited and accepted on cotton twine and two bids invited and accepted on jute twine during the fiscal year beginning last July 1.

Mr. GERLACH. The records that I have received show that they were unable to receive bids on this new twine that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] showed Members of the House last year. That was the reason they gave for asking for these additional bids. That is why they have asked for these seven additional bids.

It has cost the American taxpayers not only \$35,000, but it has cost them another \$64,000 on account of asking for bids in June, September, October, and December.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERLACH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. In order to make the RECORD complete, could the gentleman insert what it has cost on account of the "Buy American Act"? The law requires the use of American-made goods up to 25 percent. Can the gentleman tell the total that has cost the Government? Certainly the gentleman favors that provision.

Mr. GERLACH. I favor the provision of buying American goods, certainly, but I do not favor a provision that is going to cost the taxpayers close to \$100,000 additional on a purchase of \$327,000. That is just what this amounts to. If you had just let me go ahead I would have explained that to you.

Mr. PACE. Pardon the interruption.

Mr. GERLACH. Another point in the inserting of this proviso which has cost our taxpayers an additional sum of money is the fact that, because of the need for purchasing cotton twine, the Post Office Department has been forced to depart from the business procedure of making one purchase of the amount of twine needed for the fiscal year, and last year had to ask for bids at seven different times. If the Post Office, as they had previously done, would have purchased their entire supply of jute twine in June of 1939, the price would have been 11.3 cents per pound for the total amount. Under this proviso, however, they had to divide the bids, and purchase jute again in September when the price per pound had risen to 15 cents, and for the third time in December when the price had risen to 18.3 cents per pound. Thus, by buying at these varied times rather than by one bid, the Post Office Department was forced to pay the additional 7 cents per pound in the cost of jute. This meant an additional cost of \$64,200 in the cost of jute borne by the postal authorities in the past year.

When you add this cost, which could have been saved except for the fact of the proviso which necessitates these varied bids, to the \$35,000 additional cost of the cotton twine, you will find that this legislation cost our Government, and so cost the taxpayer, the total of \$99,200, or almost \$100,000, just for the purpose of buying five one-thousandths of our 1939 total of 13,000,000 bales of cotton produced. I say to you that this is a horrible situation to find in a Government which is now preaching economy, and something should certainly be done to remedy it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERLACH. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman referred to me a while ago and although I do not think he intended to do so, he left the impression that I had made an incorrect statement in saying that jute and cotton twine are equally serviceable. My authority for that statement is the Post Office Department which administers the law. I refer the gentleman to the

testimony on that subject and quote especially from the testimony of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Purdum, at page 310 of the hearings. Mr. Purdum said:

I feel that we are getting a cotton twine that is entirely satisfactory for our particular use. In other words, I believe that cotton twine is as satisfactory as is jute twine for the Postal Service.

I do not know how there could be any more conclusive statement than that. I would like to say in behalf of our subcommittee, and certainly on behalf of myself, that we want to be entirely fair in this perennial controversy between jute and cotton, but we have here the very positive recommendation of the Post Office Department that for the time being this provision be not disturbed. They would like to go ahead with their experimentation. On page 311, Mr. Purdum says:

We are doing all right under the existing legislation recently enacted by the Congress in this connection.

And he advocates the continuance of it and points out that in the state of international relations existing at this time, there may come a time when the differential in cost will be wiped out, I believe he said in his testimony, because of the difficulty of getting jute into this country.

Now, with all these conditions prevailing as they are at present and with this experimentation only part way, we thought, without taking either side of the controversy, that certainly it was a reasonable course to allow this experimentation to go on for another year. By the end of that time we will no doubt know more definitely just what the situation is, and will be able to act in the light of the circumstances that may be developed at that time.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to explain.

Mr. GERLACH. I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana, chairman of the subcommittee, that he has been very fair, and when he explained to the Members of the House that he believed that the experiment should be tried for another year, he was sincere. But I say to him on the records that I have before me, that on June 19, 1939, there were bids asked for 160,000 pounds of cotton twine. There was one bidder for the full amount. Again, in June 1939, there was a bid asked for 480,000 pounds of cotton or jute. There were no bids on the cotton. There was one bid on jute. There was a bid asked on September 18, 1939, on 200,000 pounds of new type cotton twine. No bids were received. Also on October 9, 1939, there was a bid asked for 40,000 pounds of the new type cotton twine, and again no bids were received.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERLACH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PACE. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. GERLACH. Absolutely.

Mr. PACE. Is it not true that that was because the specifications at that time were not proper specifications for the cotton twine, but that in the meantime the Bureau of Standards and the Department of Agriculture at the request of the Post Office Department have worked out specifications for cotton twine which the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General says are just as good as jute, and now bids are being made and are available at any time they are invited.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but let me ask the gentleman, Is the cotton twine that has been furnished in the past year the same twine that the gentleman showed the Members of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. I will be glad to reply to the gentleman. I cannot tell the gentleman, for this reason: In view of my interest on the floor, I have remained away from the Post Office Department to avoid any idea that somebody might think I was trying to sell twine to somebody. I do not know what twine they bought or whose it is or what it was.

Mr. GERLACH. My information is that it was the old style and not the style that the gentleman showed on the floor.

Let us remember that the manufacture of jute twine, along with other jute products, is an essentially American industry; and whereas the use of cotton twine by the postal authorities is so small an item to the cotton grower, the use of jute twine is a big item to the American jute manufacturer. It is true enough that the source of raw jute is in foreign lands, but I repeat that its manufacture is strictly and wholly American. Let us not, therefore, injure the industry and at the same time cause our Government an unnecessary additional expense of \$100,000, without benefit to anyone.

Let us remember also that in the use of the jute twine we are safeguarding that which must be tied in any manner, and safeguarding those who do the tying; for jute, unlike the cotton twine, does not stretch or cut. And at the same time we will not have to stretch our Budget, but we will be able to cut an unreasonable, undesirable expenditure of almost \$100,000.

In conclusion, in my judgment it will be well for this Congress to remember that more business in government and less government in business should be our watchword. [Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERLACH. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. I think the gentleman has made a very splendid presentation of a matter of interest not only to his own constituency but to the country at large, and he is to be congratulated for the work he has done.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the gentleman for his kind words. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, "the American market for the American farmer"; again that is becoming the battle cry of the Nation. It is the God-given right of the American farmer to sell every pound, every bushel, every quart, every ton of farm produce consumed in this country. [Applause.] I appreciate the applause because it proves that the chorus that is being sung and chanted over the entire Nation has a familiar ring; it has the same words and the same music that was played by the piper, Hoover, when he led the American farmers to believe in 1928 that a higher, and higher, and higher protective tariff on agricultural products would solve all the woes, all the financial distress, all the ills of the farmers of this country. The golden calf of 1928 leading the farmers out of the wilderness was the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. By the time the glittering gold of the new idol was revealed to the Nation in 1930, the farmers realized that the promise to raise the rates on agricultural products alone had been broken—that rates on all the products that the farmers buy had been pushed to newer and dizzier heights.

Economists, too numerous to mention, have attributed to the Hawley-Smoot tariff and its prohibition of foreign trade the start of the downfall of world economies. The Democratic Party, pledged to a fair and equitable reduction of the tariff, put into operation a system of reciprocal-trade agreements granting trade concessions to those countries that agreed to take down barriers that had been erected in retaliation to the Hawley-Smoot tariff.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

In a world torn by war and bitterness, hatred, and armament exhaustion, reciprocal-trade agreements stand out as the only movement in the world—the only legal machinery—geared to bring peace, understanding, and prosperity between nations. I do not pretend to possess a knowledge of all the products, both agricultural and manufactured, that have been affected by the reciprocal-trade agreements. But, as a cattleman, I would like to discuss briefly the effect the agreements have had on that industry.

But let me pause here and take up the effect on other farm products. It is definite that the American farmer today has, and for the last 4 years under the reciprocal-trade agreements has had, 99 percent of the pork market; 99½ percent of the

market for all dairy products has been supplied by the American farmer, and 95 percent of the beef market has been supplied by the American beef producer, even when you consider canned corned beef and other canned-beef products. If you do not consider canned-beef products, which really should not be considered, the American farmers are supplying 97½ percent of the beef market for the Nation.

This week Mr. F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American National Livestock Association, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee armed with a resolution passed by the American National Livestock Association. This resolution reads:

*Resolved, That we are definitely opposed to an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.*

Mr. Mollin stated the American National Livestock Association has a membership of between 1,500 and 2,000 cattlemen. I will not question this statement but I seriously question that the cattlemen of the West wholeheartedly endorse the resolution opposing the continuation of the Trade Act and certainly I seriously contest the fact that Mr. Mollin represents the thoughts and convictions of a majority of the western cattle producers. Allow me to quote from Mr. Mollin in his statement before the committee:

But I do feel as far as all industry is concerned, the rates that we got under that tariff act

Referring to the Hawley-Smoot Act—

Were the most equitable we have ever had.

In other words, Mr. Mollin has put the American cattle raisers that he represents on record as, first, opposing the continuation of the reciprocal-trade treaties and, second, returning in toto to the rates of the old Hawley-Smoot tariff.

Let us see what has been done in regard to cattle under the trade treaties. Has the duty on live cattle been repealed? No. Has the duty on canned beef even been reduced? No. It still stands at 6 cents per pound. And right here let me digress a minute to talk about the President's famous statement when the Navy made a purchase of 45,000 pounds of canned corned beef from the Argentine Meat Producers Co-op. In the first place, 45,000 pounds of corned beef is about enough for two Sunday night suppers for the Navy. The purchase price for the Argentine beef was 9.73 cents per pound. The lowest domestic bid for a similar quantity was 23.61 cents per pound. This meant a net saving on two meals for the Navy of \$6,246. But regardless of the economy involved, many people held up their hands in horror because the President said Argentine canned corned beef is better. The truth of the matter is their canned corned beef is better.

It is better for the very good reason that because of the great surplus of beef raised in the Argentine they are able to take the choice cuts, the loins, and the ribs, the very finest pieces of beef and make it into corned beef, place it in cans, and send it to this country. I hope the day never comes when beef becomes so cheap in this country that we can afford to put those choice cuts into cans and sell them at the price Argentine corned beef sells for in this country, which is about 15 to 20 cents per pound. The choice cuts of beef in this country today sell for about 65 cents per pound, as you will find by going to the corner grocery. They cannot put beef of that quality into cans and sell it in competition with the Argentine product. Argentine corned beef is actually a noncompetitive product. People do not go on a corned beef diet. One has corned beef once or twice a month. It is more or less of a delicacy. The only beef that the American packer puts into cans is that cheap grade of canners' cows, which certainly does not make a very edible product. If there is such a thing as a noncompetitive agricultural product, certainly South American canned beef belongs in that category. To me the fanfare, the beating of breasts, the tearing of hair, the lamentations of all those who accused the President of selling the farmer down the river for South American friendship, is a smoke screen. A smoke screen to hide the real intent and purpose of those who oppose all reciprocal-trade treaties, all farm programs, and wish



to again bamboozle the farmer with the old shell game practiced for years by the Republican Party. The shell game that kept the farmer looking for the pea under the shell that would bring him actual farm relief. The label on every shell the farmer looked under was the high protective tariff.

I am sorry to have digressed and I want to return to what has happened to the cattleman under the reciprocal-trade treaty. First, let me explode a popular misconception. The importation of dressed and chilled beef is not under consideration in any trade treaty. The sanitary pact with the Argentine prohibits the importation of any fresh beef. This sanitary pact which prohibits the importation of dressed beef cannot be repealed in a reciprocal-trade treaty. It is subject to revision by the United States Senate only.

Regarding the importation of dressed beef about which you have heard so much, and to show what the situation is, I want to read a letter I received today from Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and I call attention particularly to the last paragraph of the letter. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, January 25, 1940.

The Honorable PHIL FERGUSON,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FERGUSON: I have received your letter of January 22, 1940, and I am pleased to confirm your impression that there is no relationship between the proposed Sanitary Convention with Argentina and trade agreements.

No trade agreement entered into with any foreign country has affected or in any way relaxed the laws governing sanitary regulations and inspection of food products imported into the United States. As a matter of fact, it is customary to include in trade agreements a provision making clear that sanitary measures are not affected. For example, article XII of the present trade agreement with Canada reads in part as follows:

"2. Subject to the requirement that, under like circumstances and conditions, there shall be no arbitrary discrimination by either country against articles the growth, produce or manufacture of the other country in favor of the like articles the growth, produce or manufacture of any other foreign country, the provisions of this agreement shall not extend to prohibitions or restrictions \* \* \*  
"(b) designed to protect human, animal or plant health or life \* \* \*"

Substantially similar provisions are included in other trade agreements.

In response to your question concerning chilled and frozen beef, no concession has been granted on these products in any trade agreement so far concluded nor is any concession under consideration.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

So all the conversation dealing with the importation of chilled fresh beef depressing our market is out of the window, it is not under consideration, nor has any reduction in the duty or any privileges been extended to fresh or chilled beef.

We have taken chilled and dressed beef out of the picture. Canned beef is not competitive because we cannot commence to produce it as cheap as South America. It pays a 6-cent duty. Fresh beef is not now and cannot be considered in a trade treaty. This limits our consideration to the importation of live cattle.

Under the Canadian treaty, considering the lowest tariff of 1½ cents per pound on a limited quota of 225,000 cattle, we still have in effect a stiff duty. To show you how figures may be twisted to prove a point, to prove the old adage, "The devil can quote scripture for his purpose," I can tell you that the imports of cattle have increased from 392,000 in 1936 to 716,000 in 1939. If I stopped there you would reasonably assume that all this increase of cattle came into the United States because of the reduced tariff rate. The truth of the matter is that of the 716,000 that came into this country in 1939, 398,000 paid the full tariff rate of 1930, 2½ cents per pound. The balance paid the rate of from 1½ cents to 2 cents. I want to make this statement, that under the reduced tariff this country still has one of the highest tariffs on cattle in the world. Certainly the tariff on all grades would figure at least 25 percent on an ad valorem basis. Let us see what the tariff has been on the class that come in under the reduced rate of 1½ cents. In 1936, these cattle paid a tariff of \$19.21 per head; in 1937, \$19.68 per head; in 1938, \$18.96 per head; and in 1939, \$14.54 per head; between \$15 and \$20 per head duty paid at the reduced rate. Certainly only a very healthy domestic-cattle market would

make it profitable for these cattle to pay this duty and come into this country. The margin is very narrow and certainly a slight reduction in our domestic market would make it unprofitable to ship cattle into the United States. The quota which limits the importation at 1½ cents to 225,000 cattle adequately protects this Nation from an influx of cattle that would break our market. No more than 60,000 can come in in any 3-month period. Our market can always assimilate this number. In regard to the cattle that come in at the old 1930 rate of 2½ cents per pound, the class of cattle weighing between 200 and 700 pounds, none of these cattle come in for slaughter. They are hauled in on American railroads, grazed on American pastures, fed American grain. In reality they are the raw material from which beef is made. They pay American taxes and can come in under this heavy duty of 2½ cents per pound only when the American cattle industry is prosperous.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that the American National Livestock Association resolution read that they were opposed to the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreement unless it contained a provision for Senate ratification?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; not at all.

The resolution reads:

*Resolved*, That we are definitely opposed to an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; and (b) that, if said act is extended, it be only on the condition that all new agreements thereunder and extensions of existing agreements be ratified by the Senate in the manner provided by the Constitution.

I refuse to yield further. I have to finish this.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making an excellent speech and I wish the gentleman would yield to me so that I might aid him. Will he yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

These stock cattle in the class between 200 and 700 pounds pay an average duty of \$10 per head. In many cases, this represents a duty of 100 percent. Cattle imported into the United States since January 1, 1936, have paid an aggregate duty of \$23,600,000 on a total of 1,900,000 cattle, over \$10 per head considering all classes. Cattle are not exactly on the free list.

I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the duty paid on various classes of cattle, as follows:

This table shows:

First. Imports of beef cattle, since the first trade agreement with Canada went into effect January 1, 1936, have paid tariffs averaging \$5,906,424 a year and totaling \$23,625,698 in that period.

Second. The reduced tariff rates applicable to the annual quota—225,000 head—of cattle weighing more than 700 pounds each, has resulted in a duty ranging from \$14.22 per head in 1938 to \$19.21 per head in 1936. The reduced tariff rates applicable to the annual quota—100,000 head—of calves has resulted in a duty that has ranged from \$2.21 per head in 1937 to \$2.52 per head in the first 11 months of 1939.

Third. In 1937, 1938, and 1939 more cattle paid the tariff rates fixed in the Tariff Act of 1930 than have been imported at tariff rates reduced under trade agreements.

Fourth. The class of cattle showing the greatest increase in imports—cattle weighing from 175 pounds—200 pounds in 1939 to 700 pounds—has not had its tariff rate reduced in any trade agreement.

*Number and weight of beef cattle imported into the United States and duties collected thereon, in periods specified*

	1936	1937	1938	Jan.-Nov. 1939
Beef-cattle imports of all classes:				
Number.....	392,424	488,221	416,885	716,960
Weight (1,000 pounds).....	229,337	278,182	223,453	388,506
Duty collected.....	\$4,949,001	\$6,295,561	\$4,914,154	\$7,466,982
Beef cattle imported at tariff rates reduced under trade agreements:				
Number.....	200,814	203,050	173,054	318,034
Weight (1,000 pounds).....	153,792	154,690	126,004	228,056
Duty collected.....	\$3,040,283	\$3,053,347	\$2,484,263	\$3,420,840
Beef cattle imported at 1930 Tariff Act rates:				
Number.....	191,610	285,171	243,831	398,925
Weight (1,000 pounds).....	75,545	123,522	97,449	160,450
Duty collected.....	\$1,908,718	\$3,242,214	\$2,429,891	\$4,046,142

Number and weight of beef cattle imported into the United States and duties collected thereon, in periods specified—Continued

	1936	1937	1938	Jan.-Nov. 1939
Cattle weighing less than 700 pounds and more than 175 pounds in 1936-38, 200 pounds in 1939 (no tariff rates on this class have been changed; 1939. Tariff Act rate, 2½ cents per pound):				
Number.....	176,237	223,837	243,831	377,938
Weight (1,000 pounds).....	68,419	86,751	97,449	151,320
Average duty per head.....	\$9.66	\$9.61	\$9.96	\$10.01
Duty collected.....	\$1,702,091	\$2,161,007	\$2,429,891	\$3,782,999
Calves (weighing 175 pounds or less in 1936-38 and 200 pounds or less in 1939):				
Imported at trade-agreement tariff rate, 1½ cents per pound:				
Number.....	48,081	53,987	47,708	100,000
Weight (1,000 pounds).....	7,110	7,969	7,166	16,775
Average duty per head.....	\$2.22	\$2.21	\$2.25	\$2.52
Duty collected.....	\$106,650	\$119,528	\$107,494	\$261,626
Imported at 1930 Tariff Act rate, 2½ cents per pound:				
Number.....	9,233	28,065	-----	13,989
Weight (1,000 pounds).....	1,430	4,388	-----	2,347
Average duty per head.....	\$3.87	\$3.91	-----	\$4.27
Duty collected.....	\$35,731	\$109,704	-----	\$59,667
Total calves:				
Number.....	57,314	82,052	47,708	113,989
Weight (1,000 pounds).....	8,540	12,357	7,166	19,122
Average duty per head.....	\$2.48	\$2.79	\$2.25	\$2.73
Duty collected.....	\$142,389	\$229,232	\$107,494	\$311,293
Cattle weighing 700 pounds or more:				
Total:				
Number.....	158,873	182,332	125,346	225,033
Weight.....	152,378	179,074	118,838	218,063
Average duty per head.....	\$19.54	\$21.42	\$18.96	\$15.00
Duty collected.....	\$3,104,521	\$3,905,332	\$2,376,769	3,372,690
Imported at trade-agreement tariff rates (2 cents per pound in 1936-38; 1½ cents in 1939):				
Number.....	152,729	149,063	126,346	218,034
Weight.....	146,681	146,091	118,838	211,281
Average duty per head.....	\$19.21	\$19.68	\$18.96	\$14.54
Duty collected.....	\$2,933,625	\$2,933,819	\$2,376,969	\$3,169,214
Imported at 1930 Tariff Act rate (3 cents per pound):				
Number.....	6,144	33,269	-----	6,999
Weight.....	5,697	32,383	-----	6,783
Average duty per head.....	\$27.81	\$26.19	-----	\$29.07
Duty collected.....	\$170,896	\$971,503	-----	\$203,476

I can say without fear of contradiction that the increased consumption of beef has more than taken care of the entire importations of beef. Since 1932 the per capita consumption in the United States on beef has increased from 42 to 54 pounds. Taking 10 pounds per person on 120,000,000 people would be 1,200,000,000 pounds increase in the consumption of beef since 1932. The greatest importation of beef has occurred this year and, considering dressed beef and canned beef this year, you have an importation of some 476,000,000 pounds of beef.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, the cattlemen feel like they have already made their concessions. I am not advocating any new concessions, but I do feel we should now have the privilege of enjoying the increased consumption of beef caused by new industrial activities. I know a majority of the farmers, a majority of the cattlemen, are not ready to join Mr. Mollin in his Republican doctrine of defeating reciprocal-trade treaties and returning to the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930. The cattlemen have made their concessions. We are now in a position to benefit from increased trade, which means more wage earners, which means greater consumption of beef, which means continued good prices for our beef products.

Certainly no thinking man who has enjoyed the prosperity of the cattle business the last 4 years wants to trade cheap money, industrial activity, high beef consumption, sound banks, restored ranges, ponds, lakes, and water development, all the many blessings that the cattlemen have enjoyed, which is reflected in the bank balances of the man engaged in the cattle business, for that golden calf, that mess of pottage, the Hawley-Smoot tariff that Mr. Mollin would have us substitute, for all the efforts that have been made on behalf of the farmer and cattlemen by this administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON].

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] made an address in this House in which he urged that at least half of the first-day Mark Twain commemorative stamps should go on sale in Hartford, Conn., instead of Hannibal, Mo. I got to thinking about Mark Twain—which took me a long way back—and the conclusion I came to was that Connecticut should have all the Mark Twain stamps.

Samuel Langhorne Clemens was born in the village of Florida, Monroe County, Mo. Monroe County adjoins Ralls and Marion Counties, and he later lived in Hannibal, in Marion County. In those three counties of Monroe, Ralls, and Marion, lived the most rugged and substantial citizens of Missouri in the period immediately preceding and during the Civil War. They were largely natives of Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, who had come to Missouri to make their homes.

#### MISSOURI A BORDER STATE

Missouri was a border State during the War between the States. It produced great characters. General Grant was a resident of St. Louis prior to the commencement of the conflict. General Sherman likewise was a resident of St. Louis before the war, as well as after the war. The great Frank Blair, a Kentuckian by birth, also lived in St. Louis at that time. St. Louis was about 100 miles distant from the counties of Monroe, Ralls, and Marion. The feeling was very tense in Missouri in those days. The partisans on both sides treated the involvement most seriously, and their actions and words bespoke their candor and sincerity.

#### COL. LOUIS H. WATERS

I can best illustrate the type of Missourian who took part in the Civil War by recounting an anecdote concerning Col. Louis H. Waters, a great lawyer and a fine soldier, who served on the Union side. Colonel Waters never hesitated to speak his sentiments. Most of the men of his day are dead and gone, but he typified the group that Mark Twain associated with a little bit during the war. Whether they were Confederate or Union soldiers, they were sincere in their convictions, they were fearless, and they were plain-spoken.

Colonel Waters had been a soldier under General Harrison, who afterward became President of the United States. On a visit to Washington the Colonel called at the White House. A secretary who knew him ushered him into President Harrison's presence. When he went into the room the President was writing—and he continued to write. The secretary announced, "Mr. President, Colonel Waters, one of your old soldiers, is here to see you." The President, without looking up and still continuing to write, said, "Well, what do you want?"

Colonel Waters, mindful of the respect due the holder of the highest office of the land, very politely backed away from the President at this curt inquiry. As he backed he said, "I want nothing, sir. Nothing, sir. Not a thing, sir. Not a single thing." Then just as he got close to the door, true to being a real Missourian, he added, "Not a ——— thing at your hands."

Now, that was the type of man and soldier that came from Missouri on both sides of the War between the States. You will see in a moment why I am getting to Mark Twain in this roundabout way. I want to illustrate plainly that he was not of the same kidney as real Missourians.

#### HENRY NEWMAN

Just one other illustration. At Huntsville, a town in central Missouri, there lived a rugged noble soul by the name of Henry Newman. He served as a soldier in the Civil War on the southern side. At times he was a bit willful, especially if he had taken a drink. It once fell to him, in the later years of his life, to introduce the speaker of the evening at a Democratic rally. The speaker he was to introduce was a very eminent man who had held most of the high offices in the State of Missouri, and who had represented his congress-



sional district in the National House of Representatives. He was a high-class gentleman and a polished orator.

Henry took the platform, and he said this:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure tonight to present the speaker of the evening. It is a double pleasure for me to introduce him to you. First, he is a member of my political party; and second, he served on the same side I did in the War between the States.

As you all know, I am a Tennessean by birth. You also know that I served 4 years with the Tennessee contingent of the Confederate Army. The gentleman I am going to present to you as tonight's speaker likewise served on the Confederate side. He belonged to what was known as the Home Guards in Missouri and served with a group in his home county, Sullivan, who pledged themselves not to leave the county unless the enemy came. He served 4 years in Sullivan County.

The distinguished citizen never again permitted a speaker to introduce him without first knowing what he was going to say about him.

If there was one thing that a fighting man disliked, it was the so-called Home Guard who did no active service. I asked Henry after the meeting why he had embarrassed our friend in that way. He said it was on impulse. "You know," he said, "we hate the fellows who gave lip service without taking active part." That was the feeling of all who were involved on both sides.

#### MARK TWAIN AS A SOLDIER

As I listened to the address yesterday by the gentleman from Connecticut I could not help but think of Mark Twain in connection with his service as a soldier during the Civil War.

Mark Twain ridiculed everything and everybody. One of the special objects of his derision was religion. As a young man he was a sort of a tramp printer, going about from place to place. When the call to arms came, he was living in Hannibal. Col. Jack Burbridge, of Pike County, organized the Confederate forces in that portion of Missouri. A meeting was held at Hannibal for the purpose of enlisting men to fight for the Confederacy. The colonel took charge of the meeting, which was well attended. Among those who were there on that night was Mark Twain. Mark joined the forces and became a lieutenant.

His company had no sooner organized, however, when a fighting Kentucky Democrat, Frank P. Blair, whose brother, Montgomery Blair, was the Postmaster General in Lincoln's Cabinet, organized four regiments in eastern Missouri, composed largely of the German population of St. Louis, and offered these regiments to the Union cause. These soldiers gave contest to Colonel Burbridge and his forces in northern Missouri. Colonel Burbridge met them, and so did Mark Twain—for a few moments only. Mark Twain met them; and, as someone said, a Minié ball came whizzing past his ears, and he started running. He ran; and, oh, how fast he did run. He never stopped until he got to Keokuk, Iowa. Colonel Burbridge fought 4 years in the Southern Army; Mark Twain about 4 minutes.

New London, Ralls County, Mo., was where Mark Twain took the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy. New London, Ralls County, Mo., was where he deserted. He was 26 years old when he took the oath. He was 26 years old when he deserted. It was all done in the year of our Lord 1861. "He walked right in, turned around, and he walked right out again."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. I take it the gentleman from Missouri would be just as well satisfied if the Mark Twain commemorative stamp were put on sale elsewhere?

Mr. SHANNON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I hope the gentleman will make his sentiments known to the Postmaster General. It might help.

Mr. SHANNON. Mark Twain reached Keokuk; and when he reached there, as he said afterward, he met an old lady who was an abolitionist, and she convinced him that that was the right side. Notwithstanding that he was convinced, he did not enter the ranks of the other side, you understand; he

knew he might be shot on the other side just as well. So he continued on his marathon race until he got to Virginia City, Nev., where he was safe from any attack of any kind whatsoever. And there he stayed until the war ended—until a year and a half after the war ended. He was taking no chances. He wanted to be sure the war was over for good—no resumption.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a most interesting address. I yield him 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SHANNON. These men I speak of—these contemporaries of Mark Twain—I knew. They were the salt of Missouri. They were the salt of the Democratic Party. They never flinched anywhere. Mark Twain not only flinched; he ran—fast and furious. When the test came he was a dismal failure as a belligerent. I am pleased at this opportunity to speak about Mark Twain's war record.

#### CONFEDERATES RE-FORM DEMOCRATIC PARTY

After the war was over those faithful Burbridge soldiers of the Confederacy came back home, and under the leadership of Frank P. Blair, a Union man—they were all Democrats—re-formed the Democratic Party and they continued as such.

Let me read from Edgar Lee Masters' Mark Twain:

He had no real political principles. If he had, he would never have joined the Confederate Army and deserted from it.

The Missouri boys who enlisted with him in the Confederate Army could in time overlook his becoming a deserter. They could overlook his becoming a Republican. Edgar Lee Masters records that after Twain moved to Hartford he became a Tory; even that they could overlook. His "desouthernizing" himself, that too they could overlook. But it was too much to ask that they forget or forgive that Mark Twain, Missouri-born of a Virginia father and a Kentucky mother, consorted with those who laid the heavy and brutal hand of the oppressor upon the southern people in the days of reconstruction. That, they could not forget. That, they could never forgive.

This is the man whom this Nation intends to honor by putting his likeness on a stamp.

In conclusion, let me cite what my good friend, Capt. Billy Ely, company commander of the Burbridge Brigade, and a close and intimate friend of the late Champ Clark—a man among men—said in reply to Mark Twain's bit of sarcasm:

When I withdrew from those Missouri "Bumpkins and Rustics," the Confederacy fell.

Captain Ely said in reply with all the dignity of a soldier:

We went to war. We remained at war for 4 years. We came back home. I can say to my fellow Missourians that we had but one coward in our whole group, and his name was Samuel L. Clemens.

[Here the gavel fell.]

[Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, now that the American people are finally beginning to awaken to a realization of the serious part that our muddled money and finances are playing in this economic distress, I think it behooves every Member of Congress to do everything he can to aid and encourage the dissemination of information relating to this problem.

From the testimony given by Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, it is evident the administration wants the debt limit raised to \$50,000,000,000.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. JOHNSON] asked this question of the Secretary of the Treasury:

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Do you care to express an opinion as to whether or not you think it advisable to go beyond the \$45,000,000,000 limit? I mean so far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned.

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Yes; I think it should be raised to \$50,000,000,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is that your idea of the ultimate debt limit?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. No.

Mr. LUDLOW. Do you think that the obligations might even go higher than that?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Anything might happen, and if it was up to me I would recommend, and am willing to say so, that the debt limit should be raised to \$50,000,000,000.

Mr. McLEOD. Beyond \$50,000,000,000 would you say it would be a dangerous limit?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I would consider that as we went along. Say, at \$49,000,000,000 I would take another look at it.

Mr. McLEOD. By danger, do you mean that it would naturally be followed by unlimited inflation? Would you be afraid that inflation would follow? Beyond \$50,000,000,000 would there be a danger of inflation?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I am willing to say now, gentlemen, that there is no particular danger involved if Congress would raise the debt limit to \$50,000,000,000. Beyond that I would not venture an opinion.

Of course, the fact is that Secretary Morgenthau has no more idea where the danger point is than the man on the street. These things are entirely unknown and will only be comprehended when the fateful time comes and everybody realizes that confidence in our credit is gone.

From this it is clear that the administration wants another raise of the debt limit; this time of \$5,000,000,000.

Under the present bookkeeping policies of the Treasury, that amount would perhaps be sufficient to keep the people chloroformed for about another year.

Should there be any doubt in anyone's mind that our Federal expenditures are now out of control? After 10 years of unremitting extraordinarily heavy annual deficits such as no peacetime, free nation that I know of ever experienced, why should it not be sun-clear to everybody that these expenditures are now out of control?

The American people had better wake up, and that quickly, to a realization of this danger. Too long already we have permitted ourselves to be narcotized with the false hope that somehow and somewhere the Budget will be balanced and all will be well. That medicine will not relieve our pains much longer. The hard realities of our political follies and messing are now upon us. The limit of political tampering with the inexorable natural laws of economy, without doing mortal violence to it, has certainly been reached.

It is only by facing the hard reality of our situation that there is any hope whatever of checking the danger and averting something far worse than we have yet experienced.

All about us there is evidence of such a nature and in such volume that even the most blind should be able to see. The appropriation measure before us carries an item of \$500,000 for transportation of bullion and coin, which brings up the gold-buying program. Mark Sullivan, in his column in the Washington Post of January 25, calls it "the golden elephant"—"the Fort Knox folly." I do not know what he means by a "golden elephant" and by "folly." In themselves those terms hardly express the effects this gold-buying program is having upon our economy. No one, of course, can know all these effects, because, as Mr. Sullivan says, no nation ever did a thing of this kind before, so that we have no experience to judge from.

I should like to have the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON], who made an eloquent talk here on reciprocal-trade treaties, listen to this:

But a few things we can figure out. It is certain that the nine or ten billions of gold we received from foreigners in the last 6 years represents that amount of labor, services, and goods that the people of the United States have given away to foreigners, for which they have up to now received not a dime's worth of value. Only when and if this hoard is exported will our people receive any real pay for the things they have exported for this gold.

Considering the fact that we have paid an artificially high price for it and that we can never export it without harm to our own markets, the picture looks pretty dreary.

Is it really supposed that the American people can give away all these billions of dollars worth of goods and not harm our economy?

Take the interest the Government is losing on the \$2,000,000,000 stabilization fund alone. At 4¼ percent, the rate being paid on some of the Government bonds, we have lost over \$500,000,000 since the creation of this monstrosity.

Yet the gold-buying program goes merrily on. And the \$2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, which is used in utter violation of the purpose for which the law created it, is being continued. The law specifically provides that it is to be used to stabilize the exchange value of the dollar. It has never been used for that purpose, and could not be. It is being used to bolster the currency and economy of other nations, and for nothing else.

Perhaps one of the most fallacious beliefs that ever gripped the minds of any legislative body is that the Government can, by legislation, create purchasing power. This belief underlies the continual creation of heavy Federal deficits. There is not a scintilla of evidence that a dime's worth of purchasing power has been created by the Federal Government in the last 10 years. The word "create," according to the dictionary, means "to bring into being; to cause to exist." Where can it be shown that any purchasing power has actually been created?

This fallacy is identical with the one that the Government can create money by stamping something on bits of paper. Indeed, that is precisely, in the final analysis, what is taking place now. The Government is merely coining credit or debt, which is the same thing as the printing of money. In substance, the credit created by the heavy Government borrowing is the same as the continental bills of credit, the French assignats, and the John Law money.

The same thing is happening to us that happened to the French and our colonists in their use of irredeemable paper. No new purchasing power is created whatever, but only the savings and capital of the people are being consumed.

Nor do we need to depend on dialectics to prove this. Taking the figures of the National Industrial Conference Board, we find that the average annual realized national income, adjusted by the general price level, in 1930, 1931, 1932, and the first 3 months of 1933, was \$67,000,000,000. During that period about \$3,000,000,000 of credit money was created.

The average annual income on the same basis, beginning with April 1, 1933, through 1938, was \$67,930,000,000. This is about \$930,000,000 more per annum in the latter period of the depression than the former. During the latter period the credit money created was about \$15,000,000,000, or three times as much per annum as that of the former period.

On the basis of these figures alone, it is ridiculous to claim that the program of spending is creating any purchasing power whatever. Even if there had been an actual increase of purchasing power, it could not be attributed to the spending. Certainly the economic body must be given credit for still having some normal functions and life.

It is utter folly and short-sightedness to even suppose that the finances of the Government can be got under control with irredeemable paper money. Of course, if we should stop buying gold and do nothing else, it would cause trouble. But we should ask ourselves, What kind of trouble? The only important trouble it would bring would be that our exports would be decreased, which, when analyzed, means that the American people would stop giving away their goods, as they are now doing under the gold-buying program. It would mean that the politicians had stopped fooling the people into believing that they were selling their goods abroad, when, in reality, they are giving them away. This is the only serious effect I can see that would result from a discontinuance of the gold-buying program.

But if the gold-buying program is discontinued and an open gold-bullion market reestablished and the country put back on the gold-coin standard, with all paper fully redeem-



able, the effect will be the same as that which has always resulted from resumption of specie payment, namely, the revival of all enterprise. [Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the speech that was made a few moments ago by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma on the reciprocal-trade treaties. I was interested in that speech because of the things he said that the farmers in this country were getting. You know it makes a big difference if you happen to be on the receiving end and know something about it yourself and do not have to take somebody else's word for it.

For the six and a half or seven years of this administration I have been an operator of farms, and also since 1918. I have an accurate account of what I have been taking in and what has been done to the farmers of this country, and I do not need to take anybody's word as to what you get for the produce or animals that you sell on the farm or the cheese that is produced by the cows on the farm, because I have a complete record of it.

Now, with respect to these reciprocal-trade treaties we have in this country at the present time, I was interested in what the gentleman from Oklahoma had to say, because he stated that the Smoot-Hawley tariff, if I understood him correctly, was the cause of all the economic ills in the world today, and especially in the United States. If that were true, why has not the Democratic Party repealed the Smoot-Hawley tariff law? I do not know whether the people of this country or whether the Members of Congress realize that this "infamous" bill that he has talked about here today is still on the statute books, and 58 percent of its schedules are now in operation, and it is lucky for this country that such a large percentage of its schedules are in operation.

They talk about canned beef coming in here from South America and how good it is. These canned-beef stories remind us of the canned platform of the Democratic Party of 1932, which has been done away with entirely.

We have been handing out thousands and millions of dollars, and even billions of dollars, to the American farmer of this country, and last year the Secretary of Agriculture said that if we did not grant \$125,000,000 for the purchase of surplus commodities the prices would go as low as they did in 1932, and if it were not for the war in foreign nations today we would have that situation confronting us now and they would be as low as they were in 1932. The price of hogs today is 5 cents a pound. Do you know what the prices of dairy products are? Do you know that last August the price of butterfat from the cheese factories was down to 28 cents a pound, while in 1928 and 1929 it was as high as 60 cents a pound? This is the situation that confronts us today.

The trade treaties mentioned here are nothing more nor less than free trade. The tariff law is still in effect, but it is inoperative. In 1893 we had free trade, and I am old enough to remember what free trade is.

At that time an old German in my locality figured it out pretty well, I think, when he said, "Naught is naught and figure is a figure, but nothing is coming to Schuster." That is what we have under these reciprocal-trade treaties. They have been dressed up in nice new clothes and called reciprocal-trade treaties, while in reality they are nothing more nor less than the free trade of 1893.

We are gradually going to get away from the situation because the farmers of this country understand they are not getting any place with paying out these billions of dollars by the Government. A few years ago we only had a small number of employees in the Department of Agriculture. We only had small appropriations, less than \$100,000,000. Today we have over 100,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture alone and last year we appropriated \$1,300,000,000 for the farmers of this country. You can see where they are today. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, after having spent 4 or 5 weeks working on this bill with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and other members of the subcommittee, I want to say that I believe the bill represents as satisfactory a cut as we could get under the circumstances in the estimates that were presented to us for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. It is only \$11,000,000 in a total of \$1,100,000,000, but it is almost entirely a service appropriation and almost entirely one of activities that cannot be cut out. The only way you can really save large sums of money is on bills that are for activities that can be done away with or curtailed.

There were some problems in connection with the bill that still exist. For instance, on October 31, 1939, there were 7,423 so-called emergency employees, paid out of relief funds, doing work in the Treasury Department. They are mostly employed on activities that are created with reference to disbursement, auditing, and procurement work relating to the relief problem. But, nevertheless, there are a large number, probably ten or twelve hundred, who are not engaged at all in relief activities, but who are paid from that roll. That presents a situation where it is absolutely impossible for any committee of the House to supervise and scrutinize properly the rolls that are presented to us by the Treasury Department. I am in hopes that before long we can reach that stage where we will be able to cut from any activity not absolutely strictly relief, in the different departments, all funds that are appropriated for relief purposes. It is about time that we began to do business where we could tell something about it and where the Congress could have the checks that it should have upon relief activities and its appropriations.

Now, in the last year we have gone on buying silver and buying gold, and in the course of the 12 calendar months of 1939 we have added something like \$3,000,000,000 in gold to the stocks in the Treasury. This is a menace to our entire economic set-up. It is true that of the \$17,000,000,000 of gold in the Treasury only a small part of it, something like two and a half billion, or a little less, is really the property of the United States.

The rest of it is not available to issue certificates against. It is not available for any purpose that the Government has in mind, because certificates are outstanding against that fund to the tune of upward of \$12,600,000,000. So the statement that some have made to the effect that all that \$17,000,000,000 of gold was available to issue certificates against, or as a sinking fund to protect a large increase in currency, are not correct and they are not based upon the Treasury statement or gold in the Treasury.

We have another situation, the continued purchase of silver. I especially deprecate the continued purchases of foreign silver. As we get that silver into the Treasury at a market price of something like 35 cents an ounce, we are issuing silver certificates against it based on \$1.29 an ounce. The result of that is that these silver certificates are issued at nearly 4 for 1; that is, all the value there is back of them is about one-quarter of the face of the certificate. So that situation is growing more and more acute as we continue to buy large quantities of silver. The purchase of silver should at least be confined, regardless of whatever other position one might take, to domestic-mined silver.

There is an especially acute condition in the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. They have 400 employees there who are paid from the relief rolls, who are devoting themselves entirely to other things—to the regular activities of that Procurement Division. Frankly, I have always thought, and I still think, that the Procurement Division is more of a menace than it is a help to the governmental organization. They enter into contracts with different people on competitive bids to supply any quantity that different departments of the Government may ask along certain lines of

commodities. Then the departments make a practice of going on and buying on those contracts. The result of that operation is that largely they pay more money for the commodities than they would if they were advertising for any substantial, definite quantity themselves. They avoid, in effect, the operation of that statute which requires that departments buy their commodities upon competitive bidding. I think that outfit requires a great deal more careful study and a great deal more reorganization than the Appropriations Committee, in the time it can give to such an organization, can allow. I think that the proper committees of this Congress should go into that question thoroughly and should revamp and revise that outfit, doing away with a very large portion of its operations. Cut it down. I think it would save the Government money.

I want to call attention to another thing that has not particularly to do with the bill but which to my mind is quite significant.

On page 229 of the Treasury Department hearings there appear the amounts of the exports and imports for the fiscal years beginning in 1923 and ending in 1939. Those figures indicate that in the period from 1925 to 1929, when we had a high protective tariff and the people of our country were employed and busy and had money in their pockets to spend, the imports of this country ranged from \$4,147,000,000 up to as high as \$4,400,000,000. Most of those imports were not competitive imports, but because people had money with which to buy they were buying noncompetitive foreign products; whereas, in the years from 1935 to 1939 the imports run from \$1,700,000,000 to \$2,900,000,000, and for the year 1939 they were \$2,094,000,000.

What does this mean? It means that a larger volume of competitive imports came in not as a result of the reciprocal-trade agreements in 1935-39. We have not so much imports in toto, and the reciprocal-trade agreements do not promote foreign trade, but stifle it, because they destroy the purchasing power of the American people.

I now want to call your attention to a matter that, to my mind, is very important, something that was developed in the hearings. I call attention to the testimony of Mr. Irey, for many, many years the head of the Secret Service Division of the Internal Revenue Bureau, with reference to the Louisiana cases. I am not going to read all of his testimony, but shall read a little of it:

Mr. TABER. Are you familiar with the investigations that we have been hearing about a good deal concerning the Long income-tax matter in Louisiana?

Mr. IREY. Yes. We conducted the investigation. Mr. Burford, who is present, was the agent in charge of that investigation.

Mr. TABER. What was the result of those operations?

Mr. IREY. Quite a number of individuals were indicted who were not tried after the first case. A Mr. Fisher was convicted and sentenced; and then there was a trial of another case, Shushan, which resulted in an acquittal. There were no further cases tried after that.

Mr. McLEOD. What about the head of the university?

Mr. IREY. I was talking about the older cases; they were prior to the case you mention.

Mr. McLEOD. I see.

Mr. IREY. That was back in 1935, and the others were in 1939.

Mr. TABER. Why were not those cases followed up and brought to a conclusion?

Mr. IREY. You are asking me a question, Mr. TABER, that I cannot answer. We made these investigations and made reports to the Department of Justice, which prosecutes these cases. The question as to determination of prosecution is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice.

Mr. TABER. Did you complete your investigations?

Mr. IREY. We did complete the investigations of these cases and there had been indictments, I think, in 20 or 25 cases. We had completed our investigations and reported them to the Department of Justice.

Mr. TABER. And you had developed evidence that seemed to you sufficient to warrant convictions?

Mr. IREY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. In 20 or 25 cases?

Mr. IREY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. And what actuated the Department of Justice in easing off in that situation is beyond your ken?

Mr. IREY. It is not within our province.

Mr. TABER. But there was no slip-up so far as your organization was concerned?

Mr. IREY. None that I know of.

Subsequently the Bureau of Internal Revenue successfully disposed of the civil features of these cases before the Board of Tax Appeals.

Mr. McLEOD. That was in the same cases which were not brought to trial?

Mr. IREY. In the same cases.

Mr. McLEOD. And you recovered in the civil action?

Mr. IREY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. How much money was involved in those cases?

Mr. IREY. Mr. Burford can tell you that.

Mr. BURFORD. We have collected about \$2,000,000, which includes taxes, penalty, and interest.

I wonder if it would be out of place for me to ask: Where was the Department of Justice? And if we have a Department of Justice, and if it is on the job doing what it ought to do? To my mind, this situation discloses a picture where the Department of Justice has not been on the job. I have known many cases being heard before the Judiciary Committee of this House which were not nearly so bad as this picture which is painted here by Mr. Irey on page 392 of the hearings.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is that under the caption "Louisiana Purchase"?

Mr. TABER. It is supposed to be the second Louisiana Purchase. [Laughter.] There has been no activity whatever with reference to upward of 20 of these cases, and the fact that in each of these cases the Bureau of Internal Revenue was able to make collections along the line that Mr. Burford suggested indicates they had a good case. I do not know what consideration moved the Government or anyone else to prevent the prosecution of those cases, but I do know that it presents a disgusting and appalling situation when we cannot have and do not have the prosecution of criminals by the Department of Justice where it is perfectly apparent that a good case exists upon which that prosecution might be had and might be carried to a successful conclusion. I do not know of any case within my service in the Congress that to me is more appalling and more disgusting. I think it calls for the most sincere and outspoken action on the part of those in charge of the Government to try and clear up that situation, and I cannot see why the Department of Justice has not been on the job. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Refunding internal-revenue collections: For refunding internal-revenue collections, as provided by law, including the payment of claims for the fiscal year 1941 and prior years and accounts arising under "Allowance or draw-back (Internal Revenue)," "Redemption of stamps (Internal Revenue)," "Refunding legacy taxes, act of March 30, 1928," and "Repayment of taxes on distilled spirits destroyed by casualty," \$42,000,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress by internal-revenue districts and alphabetically arranged of all disbursements hereunder in excess of \$500 as required by section 3 of the act of May 29, 1928 (sec. 3776, I. R. C.), including the names of all persons and corporations to whom such payments are made, together with the amount paid to each.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the members of the subcommittee handling this bill to the proviso which begins at line 14 and ends on line 20. That report comes out every year and is referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman. It lies over there about 30 days, during which time the newspapermen are allowed to come in, look at it, and, if they want to copy anything off of it, they do so. The amounts involved are small. When large amounts are involved, where the Joint Committee on Taxation had to pass on the matter, they are published at the time. Likewise, when the Board of Tax Appeals renders a decision and orders a refund, the facts are published then. You see, there is a duplication to a certain extent.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be well for the committee to consider next year the advisability of striking out this proviso. I can see no useful purpose in printing this information, and it costs the taxpayers money to prepare this list. You have the totals of refunds in your hearings; and



then again you must remember that while the law provides that the refunds must be published, the law also prohibits any information disclosing the additional amounts that are collected. It so happens that every year the additional amount in taxes, penalties, and interest collected are about 25 or more times as much as the refunds; but when you announce to the public the amount of the refunds and give them no information in reference to the additional collection, they are bound to feel that all the money is going out and nothing coming in. I do not think that the preparation of this list, in view of the important refunds being made public during the year, serves a useful purpose that justifies the expense, and I therefore offer my suggestion to the committee that next year it consider the advisability of leaving out this proviso.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Additional airplanes: For additional airplanes and their equipment, including radio equipment, spare parts, and accessories, to be constructed or purchased in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$500,000 ("B" item), to remain available until June 30, 1942.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to propound a couple of queries of the chairman of the subcommittee.

I understand the amount allowed for airplanes in the Budget was something over \$2,000,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is correct.

Mr. CULKIN. And the committee has cut this to \$500,000?

Mr. LUDLOW. We reduced the amount to \$500,000.

Mr. CULKIN. I am interested in this item by reason of being a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The bill authorizing this appropriation was given a full hearing before our committee, and it appears that these new planes were necessary for the protection of the lives of the traveling public.

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that the planes to which he refers in the estimate submitted by the Coast Guard were not asked for that purpose at all. They were asked for enforcement of neutrality and not for the regular operation to which the gentleman refers. In connection with the enforcement of neutrality there is a co-operative arrangement between the Coast Guard and the Navy. The Navy has any number of planes for this service. With this in view and considering the accretions of new airplanes we have regularly been giving the Coast Guard Service, this addition, which would have consisted of eight long-range planes and seven intermediate planes, we felt was not necessary and not justified; so we reduced the amount to \$500,000 without any effort to apply the appropriation to any particular type of plane, leaving that to the discretion of the Commandant of the Coast Guard. We respect the gentleman's great interest in the Coast Guard and we assure you of our own interest in that splendid service.

Mr. CULKIN. I may say to the gentleman our committee was very much impressed with the necessity of having a stronger type of plane with a greater cruising radius. The gentleman will probably remember that not long ago one of the Coast Guard planes landed alongside of a tramp steamer to take off a sick man, and as the plane landed in a sea with moderate crest it broke in two. Several men lost their lives. Of course, the committee assumes full responsibility for this deduction. I am not going to offer an amendment at this time.

Mr. LUDLOW. We certainly were very conscientious in giving to the Coast Guard all the planes we thought were justified, and, while we recognize the force of what the gentleman is saying, still there is a bottom to the United States Treasury. We felt that we ought to cut down the expenses, when it can be done with sense and reason. We do not regard such a large number of additional airplanes as essential for the operation of the Coast Guard. That is the view we took of this matter.

Mr. CULKIN. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that the maintenance of an adequate Coast Guard properly equipped is one of the very essential functions of decent, civilized government. It cannot be cut out on any theory of economy. It performs the dual functions of police and fire departments over both oceans and is doing a magnificent job. No one would think of crippling the fire department in his own city. The Coast Guard is in the same category.

Mr. LUDLOW. We recognized that, and we did not deprive the Coast Guard of its necessary facilities. We feel we have been very generous with the Coast Guard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

When used herein under the heading "Coast Guard," the words in parentheses, "A" item and "B" item, shall mean, respectively, "amounts for or relating to regular activities" and "amounts for or relating to activities pursuant to Executive Order No. 8254, dated September 18, 1939."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to express my gratitude to the committee for the consideration that has been given the Coast Guard station in my congressional district.

As early as June 15, 1936, there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my interest in this necessary improvement. Detroit is the fourth largest city in the Nation. The nearest Coast Guard station, and a temporary one at that, is located at Trenton, some 25 miles away. Chicago has three lifesaving stations, Buffalo and Cleveland have one each.

The traffic through the Detroit River is recognized as the greatest water traffic in the world. The necessity for the improvement was apparent to the committee. Accordingly and rightfully so they saw fit to grant this much-needed improvement for which the people of a great city will be most appreciative. Roughly 15,000 pleasure and commercial craft are registered out of the district. These include speed, sail, and small craft. The lake is a winter as well as a summer playground and this, coupled with heavy tonnage and lake transportation, adds to the danger of the situation.

The record further reveals that 170 bodies have been recovered from the waters since 1936. Therefore, the committee is to be congratulated upon its recognition of the facts as they exist and in appropriating the funds to establish the ever-vigilant Coast Guard at the city of the straits.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the Treasury Department Appropriation Act of 1941.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the committee before we leave this title if they gave any consideration to cutting out the entire appropriation for the Federal Alcohol Administration. This item appears on page 21 and amounts to \$415,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. I can say to the gentleman that, of course, we were acting pursuant to law. This is an activity set up by law. It would have been a pretty drastic procedure for us to have stricken down an institution that has statutory authority back of it. I may say that I believe there is some thought that the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Internal Revenue Bureau might properly extend its jurisdiction and assume those activities, but that is just a desultory thought and it was not given any consideration by the committee so far as striking out altogether the appropriation for the institution was concerned.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think it should have been. How much was the request reduced by the committee?

Mr. LUDLOW. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Coming from Kentucky, I probably have somewhat the same viewpoint as has the gentleman about the Federal Alcohol Administration. However, under the law permits have to be issued, and the persons engaged in the

industry in the gentleman's district and in my district could not function if there were no funds appropriated to administer the law. Therefore, although the gentleman may have certain opinions about the Federal Alcohol Administration, it was necessary for the purpose of maintaining the industry, at least, to let them exist. The committee made the cut which they felt should be made, and a not excessive one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As I said the other day in my remarks in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill, I believe we could well consider cutting out a lot of these administrative commissions and agencies, and this is one of those I have in mind.

I have here a pamphlet which I received yesterday, I believe from Brewery Age. I do not know anything about Brewery Age, but this article is written by Mr. Joseph Dubin, who seems to be somewhat of an authority on this subject of the Federal Alcohol Administration. He evidently is an official or is employed in connection with the brewery business or the distillery business.

Mr. Dubin states that we should eliminate the Federal Alcohol Administration for the reason that its functions, with minor exceptions, are duplications of the functions of other and older departments of the Government, and that the F. A. A. has not demonstrated that it can perform these functions with any greater results than can be and have been produced by the older departments. We could thereby save over \$400,000.

He refers specifically to the Food and Drugs Department, a department that has demonstrated its ability to operate with outstanding efficiency. He refers specifically to the Federal Trade Commission as a commission which is duplicating the activities of the Federal Alcohol Administration, and he also refers specifically to the Internal Revenue Bureau and its Alcohol Tax Unit as doing exactly the same things the Federal Alcohol Administration is set up to do. Manifestly we should do away with either one or the other of these overlapping groups.

I shall later ask permission to place this entire article in the RECORD so that Members of the House can read the argument of this man, who is evidently an expert on this subject, probably much more so than any of us, that being his business. I assume he knows what he is talking about. It seems to me he is making a good suggestion, one which we should adopt and carries a good sound line of argument in his article.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman may be making a good suggestion for legislative action, but it certainly would stop the industry entirely were no appropriation made for the activities of the F. A. A. for the year 1941. Until such legislative action is taken, such action as will set up the proper machinery for taking care of the work if the law relating to the F. A. A. is done away with, this object cannot be attained by denying the appropriation. Probably a great improvement could be made, however, by the proper sort of legislation, possibly handling the work as it was handled a few years ago.

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I say that Mr. Dubin in his article makes a very good argument on that subject, as he has covered every important function of the Federal Alcohol Administration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. May I say to the gentleman that I believe this outfit is totally incompetent. I believe they do not have enough legitimate business to do, so that they are able to spend all their time figuring out how they can spend the last

dollar of their appropriation. Last year they had an appropriation of \$425,000, and they had it figured down so that they had left of the appropriation only \$11, a smaller percentage of balance than any other Bureau or Department of the Government. All they have to do is figure out how they can spend their money. I believe this is a situation which should have a little help from the Congress as far as getting incompetents off the payroll is concerned.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I believe the gentleman will observe by this time that he has developed a good deal of sympathy for his viewpoint. I may say, however, that what he seeks to have done would have to be done through legislative action. The statute states that the various liquor establishments must have permits to operate, and if this machinery is stricken down and there is no way to obtain permits, I can see no other outcome than the wiping out of the industry. Of course, the gentleman does not have in mind doing that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As I understand from this article of Mr. Dubin's, the only permits involved are for interstate operation, and there is very little of that going on now. Most of the business is intrastate.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. Every establishment has to get a permit to operate.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I still think we should save this money and get along without this commission and many others. [Applause.] I ask permission to insert herewith the article by Mr. Dubin entitled "Save \$425,000, Eliminate the F. A. A."

The article is as follows:

[From Brewery Age for January 1940]

SAVE \$425,000; ELIMINATE THE F. A. A.

(By Joseph Dubin)

In these days of \$8,000,000,000 Federal Budgets and of a \$45,000,000,000 public debt, the sum of \$425,000 may appear to be relatively insignificant to the executive and legislative branches of our National Government. Nevertheless, at least the former branch, as evidenced by the President's Budget message submitted to Congress on January 4, has placed itself on record as favoring operating economies and consequent reductions in the operating expenditures of the Federal Government provided the reductions do not result in the impairment of vital governmental activities and functions. In his Budget message the President pointed out that reorganization of Government bureaus had resulted in a saving of \$11,000,000 in the current fiscal year and the reduction of a similar sum in the Budget for the 1941 fiscal year, adding: "With further readjustment in the machinery and business practices of the Government, additional savings will be realized."

Elsewhere in his Budget message the President, in commenting on that part of the proposed Budget covering the operating costs of the regular departments of the Government, said: "These are down to the bedrock of the activities and functions ordered by the Congress. If further savings are to be made in these operating costs, the Congress will have to direct by statute the elimination of many functions. And even if they should do so, the amount saved in this Budget could only be a small percentage of the total. Therefore, those who call for further cuts should have the courage and honesty to specify where they should be made."

We do not pretend to be familiar with all, or even many, of the phases of Government operation in which further economies are possible. Unquestionably, there must be several places where, as the President said, "readjustments in the machinery and business practices of the Government" will result in savings. However, we are familiar with one phase of Government operation where a saving, substantial in itself even though a small percentage of the total Budget, may be effected without any impairment of essential Government activities and functions. Hence, we offer what we believe to be the constructive recommendation that the Federal Alcohol Administration be eliminated and that the resultant saving of \$425,000 annually (the sum allotted to it for the current fiscal year and also recommended by the Budget Bureau for allotment to it during the 1941 fiscal year) be used to reduce the Budget or for national-defense purposes.

Why eliminate the Federal Alcohol Administration? For the reason that its functions with minor exceptions are duplications of the functions of other, and older, departments of the Government, and that the F. A. A. has not demonstrated that it can perform these functions with any greater results than can and have been produced by the older departments.

One function of the F. A. A. is to safeguard the public against false or misleading branding and labeling, a function that is a duplication of a function of the Food and Drugs Department, a Department that has demonstrated its ability to operate with outstanding efficiency.

Another function of the F. A. A. is to safeguard the public against false or misleading advertising, a function that is a duplication of a



function of the Federal Trade Commission, a commission that has demonstrated constantly increasing efficiency and activity in eliminating advertising that misleads or deceives the public.

Another function of the F. A. A. is to issue so-called basic permits to manufacturers, bottlers, importers, and wholesalers of alcoholic beverages, except to brewers, a function that is not a duplication of that of another agency. Issuance of permits is conditioned on the fitness of the applicant to become a potential legal member of the alcoholic beverage industries and retention of permits is conditioned upon compliance with the twenty-first amendment and with all Federal liquor laws. Through the threat of permit suspension or revocation the F. A. A. is afforded a weapon with which to assist in the enforcement of the twenty-first amendment, principally as it applies to the movement of liquor across State lines in violation of State laws. During the latest fiscal year, 16 permits were suspended, 1 was revoked, and 23 surrendered due to such violations. However, the Internal Revenue Bureau and its alcohol tax unit have far greater powers to enforce the twenty-first amendment, including the institution of criminal proceedings, whereas the most drastic penalty the F. A. A. may impose is revocation of permits. If the issuance of basic permits is essential to the enforcement of the law, which we doubt, that function could readily be transferred to the Internal Revenue Bureau and joined with the issuance of special tax stamps, a present function of that bureau.

Another function of the F. A. A. is to attempt enforcement of the trade-practice provisions of the F. A. A. Act, provisions which prohibit producers and wholesalers of alcoholic beverages from requiring or inducing a retailer to purchase their products to the exclusion in whole or in part of products of others, by agreement, by having an interest in the retailer's license or premises, by giving or lending things of value, by commercial bribery, etc. We use the term "attempt enforcement" advisedly and in keeping with the admission of the F. A. A. that "the results obtained have not been commensurate with the time and effort expended." The lack of results in enforcing this part of the law is attributed by the F. A. A. to the uncertain language of the section, the F. A. A. requesting the enactment of legislation that would make the prohibited practices "categorically unlawful." However, even if that recommended change were enacted, it would have little, if any, effect on enforcement. That is a fact that the F. A. A. cannot successfully dispute.

It must be remembered that the twenty-first amendment, as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court, gives to the States the supreme power to regulate and control liquor within their respective borders. Hence the jurisdiction of the F. A. A. is limited by the amendment to interstate transactions. Its jurisdiction is further limited to interstate transactions by the language of the F. A. A. Act, and even its jurisdiction in interstate matters is limited with respect to malt beverages unless the State into which the product is shipped has similar prohibitions or requirements on purely intrastate transactions.

Hence, it is clear that even if the trade practices mentioned in the F. A. A. Act were made "categorically unlawful" and the limitation of the F. A. A.'s jurisdiction over malt beverages were lifted, the F. A. A. would still have jurisdiction over only interstate transactions and the interstate shipper would be prohibited from doing things which the intrastate shipper might continue to do lawfully. The interstate shipper would then, in order to be in a position to meet competitive conditions, find it necessary to employ circuitous methods, and circuitous methods that comply with the letter of the law would not be too difficult to discover.

Under the existing interpretation of the twenty-first amendment, it is up to the States to enact and enforce whatever prohibitions they individually deem desirable. It is up to the States to prescribe the type of labeling and branding they will permit on liquors sold within their borders. It is up to the States to decide the extent and the wording of liquor advertising originating within their borders for distribution within their borders. Only on interstate advertising does the F. A. A. have control and then only jointly with another Federal agency. That is, as we have previously pointed out, likewise true in the case of other F. A. A. activities and functions.

Inasmuch as the jurisdiction of the F. A. A. is so limited on many phases of liquor regulation and control and its work on other phases is merely a duplication of work delegated by other laws to older and more experienced agencies of the Government, we sincerely recommend to the President, to his Budget makers, and to Congress the complete elimination of the F. A. A., with the saving of \$425,000 to be used for a reduction of the Budget or for more essential Government activities, such as national defense.

November beer sales, 1933 to 1939

[In terms of barrels of 31 gallons each]

	In bottles <sup>1</sup>	In barrels and kegs	Total	Percent of bottled beer
November 1933.....	286,159	1,405,554	1,691,713	16.91
November 1934.....	693,054	2,274,577	2,967,631	23.35
November 1935.....	1,009,651	2,356,190	3,365,841	30.00
November 1936.....	1,409,650	2,230,652	3,640,302	38.72
November 1937.....	1,704,824	2,212,339	3,917,163	43.52
November 1938.....	1,749,850	2,024,126	3,773,976	46.36
November 1939.....	1,882,579	1,943,758	3,826,337	49.20

<sup>1</sup> Includes all containers of 1 gallon or less.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOBBS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8068) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a few extracts from a speech made by former Ambassador Gibson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on Maury, Jackson, and Lee, delivered at Confederate Memorial Hall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the majority leader will tell us at this time what is the program for next week.

Mr. RAYBURN. On Monday, omnibus claims bills will be called. On Tuesday we expect to take up the agricultural appropriation bill. On Wednesday we will call a committee or two on the calendar following the Committee on Naval Affairs, which was called last Wednesday, and on Thursday we will continue the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before this body a bill entitled "A bill to prevent discrimination against graduates of certain schools and those acquiring their legal education in law offices in the making of appointments to Government positions the qualifications for which include legal training or legal experience." This bill has passed the Senate with but one dissenting vote. The debate just prior to its passage will be found on page 9674 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, under date of Friday, July 21, 1939.

The most amazing aspect of this pending bill is the fact that a situation has arisen which makes it necessary. We are but recently emerged from an era of domestic unhappiness and confusion. Under the leadership of our great President, we have been and are now pushing forward on new frontiers. We have won many victories which are apparent to all men

regardless of their political affiliations or party loyalties. We have preserved intact the great fundamental liberties found in the Bill of Rights. That this is so, Mr. Speaker, is proof of the fact that democracy still works, at least in America.

To my mind, the heart of these guaranteed liberties is the offer of hope and of promise for the future. To my mind, the fact that any man, however humble his origin, may hope to gain the highest office of our land is an awesome and wonderful thing. That "all men are created equal" and that all shall have equal opportunity to share in the natural abundance of our great country is our American ideal. After a century and a half this ideal has become known throughout the world and is a symbol of America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the "price of liberty is eternal vigilance," and, accordingly, I now invite your attention to the situation which has made necessary the bill which I have just read.

We all know that the several States of the Union have some means for determining who shall become members of the legal profession. We know that in most instances a board of examiners is set up which requires that certain examinations as to character and intelligence of the applicant must be taken. We have thought that any young man of industry, intelligence, and good character might aspire to become an attorney at law. We have been led to believe that after such a young man has passed his bar examinations and had been admitted to the bar he was then entitled to practice law. We have assumed that he might work to the top of his profession; that he might become a member of the legal staff of the United States Government; that he might become Attorney General of the United States. In short, we have been led to believe that after he was admitted to the bar he might seek employment as an attorney nearly anywhere he might choose.

We have been wrong, Mr. Speaker. We have slept on our liberties and are now awakened to find that while we slept they have been, and are now being jeopardized. At the hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Civil Service of the United States Senate held last April and ably presided over by Senator NEELY of West Virginia, evidence was adduced and is set forth in that subcommittee's report, that in the Department of Agriculture, and in the agency known shortly as "wage and hours", numerous instances occurred where candidates for legal positions within that agency and within that Department were denied the privilege of even filing an application as an attorney even though they were members of the bar in good standing. We learn that the solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has issued a rule that no attorneys will be considered for legal positions unless they went to a school approved by the two associations mentioned in the committee's report. On page 31 of the hearing before the subcommittee above referred to, the solicitor of the Department of Agriculture says that he did in fact promulgate such a ruling as to all applicants for legal positions in the Department of Agriculture. On that page and for several pages following, under the questioning of several members of the Senate's Committee on Civil Service he attempted with little or no success to explain his reasons for the discriminatory order.

This situation has actually come to pass and is continuing and will go on unless and until this body does something about it. And, if nothing is done about it, perhaps in a few more years the rules promulgated by that individual will be, that all applicants for legal positions, even though members of the bar of the highest court of their States or of the United States, must have all gone to a certain law school in order to be considered as applicants for a position in any legal department of the Government. And the rule might then well embrace a clause that the attorney should have been born into a well-to-do home, that his father earned the son's way through college and the father belonged to the best and most well-stocked clubs, and had an income of no small means.

Mr. Speaker, my quarrel is not with any law school. Fortunately perhaps is the man who was able to study law at certain law schools. My point is simply that all young men are not able to go to certain law schools. I am thinking of the young man, who, having been forced to work at an early age to help support others in his family, does not find the money nor the time to enter law school until he is perhaps

30 years of age. There are hundreds of thousands of these young men in America. Employed adults who pay their own way through law schools conducted after working hours. We all know dozens of them right on Capitol Hill. Secretaries to Members of Congress, clerks, elevator operators, and the like who are getting their law the hard way in an evening law school. These young men should at least not be hindered if we cannot help them. Their path should not be made more difficult.

These young men would doubtless have liked to have gone to a large full-time university; to have earned an A. B. degree and lived a life of secluded ease and luxury and then have gone on to a full-time law school. They might have been the better for having gone and then they might not. Woodrow Wilson, when he was president of Princeton University, told a graduating class composed of its rich young men:

Most of you fellows are doomed to obscurity. You will not do anything. You will never try to do anything, and with all the great tasks of the country waiting to be done, probably you are the very men who will decline to do them. Some man who has been "up against it," some man who has come out of the crowd, somebody who has had the whip of necessity laid on his back, will emerge out of the crowd, will show that he understands the crowd, understands the interests of the Nation, united and not separated, and will stand up and lead us.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, this happens and Woodrow Wilson spoke a great truth. Let us not, therefore, close the door of opportunity to these hard-working young men and women. Let us not say that we deny our great American ideal of equal opportunity and that it is a thing of the past.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the remarks I made this afternoon an article by Joseph Dubin, which was carried in *Brewery Age*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### CIVIL SERVICE—THE ALL-AMERICAN CAUSE

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a question. I seem to hear no question; I hear none and, therefore, I shall proceed for 30 minutes unyieldingly—though, I hope, not ungenially.

Mr. Speaker, I harbor the conviction that every politician has at least one speech in him, and I make of myself no exception. I am, however, extraordinarily choice about the subject on which I am willing to commit myself in public, and especially in a forum of such ancient dignity and present competence as the House of Representatives. I do not like to speak on unpopular causes. I am "agin" communism, I am "agin" sin, I am "agin" disunion in nation or party. I am for righteousness and I am overwhelmingly for national unity, for patriotism—and, I may add, for mother and home and heaven. [Applause.]

I am fortified to see that we are agreed upon these fundamentals.

#### A POLITICIAN IN QUEST OF AN ALL-POPULAR CAUSE

I have been looking for a cause more timely than these, however, upon which I might get the one speech out of me that I think is in me. It has to measure up to the specification that there is not going to be anybody "agin" it. I have been greatly surprised during my sojourn in the House of Representatives to find out how few causes there are that somebody is not opposed to. I thought at one time I would seek an opportunity to speak in behalf of the committee investigating un-American activities, and then I discovered there were 21 Members of this House against that. Certainly I am not going to be caught out on any limb like that, with 21 people against my cause, for I can recall one historic supper, according to ancient and sacred report, from which hardly more than half of that number of people went



forth to overturn an empire and themselves to become the seed-sowers of a new justice, both merciful and wise.

I was also afraid to speak upon that measure, though I was happy enough to vote for it, because as I observe the course of American public life, we are extraordinarily slow to honor prosecutors with subsequent opportunities for civic responsibilities. I hope we can save the members of that committee from the fate of later neglect by weaning the committee from prosecution to investigation. With these thoughts in mind, I passed up that fairly popular cause in the interest of finding one very much more popular on which I could exhibit myself.

#### THE CAUSE FOUND IN CIVIL SERVICE

Rejoice with me, Mr. Speaker; for I have at last—at long last—found such a cause. It is that of civil service in the Federal Government of the United States.

I propose, therefore, during my remaining time, without fear of getting in bad with anybody here or with my constituents back home, to celebrate, not so much the merit of the civil service as the extraordinary situation which I have discovered, that here is a matter on which there is no disagreement in the House of Representatives. Here is a cause in which we fearful ones, as well as we fearless ones, can unite, assured of the acclaim of all of the galleries in an election year.

Why do I say so? I say it, in the first place, because last week we witnessed numerous forms of the celebration of the fifty-seventh anniversary of the establishment of the civil service in the United States. I heard many voices raised in celebration, but I did not hear one voice, by radio or otherwise, in deprecation. I can recall that even such a popular matter last year as the celebration of debt week by my friends on the left developed a good deal of opposition. I, myself, raised then a dissident voice in favor of a more practical sincerity. But to this celebration of the first half century of civil service I heard no reproachful voice.

I say it, in the second place, because out of a heavy mail on the Ramspeck bill—H. R. 960—I have not had, so far as I recall, one single letter opposed to the extension of civil service.

These reasons for believing in its popularity partake of the personal, and might lead me astray. Imagine my relief, therefore, in finding that both our great political parties had unanimously revealed the popularity of civil service—with the Gallup polls—by declaring unequivocally for its integrity and expansion. Politicians do not put things into writing for light and transient causes. My mind was made up—I had found my cause—when I read these two planks of the platforms of 1936.

The Democratic platform says:

For the protection of government itself and the promotion of its efficiency we pledge the immediate extension of the merit system through the classified civil service, which was first established and fostered under Democratic auspices, to all non-policy-making positions in the Federal service. We shall subject to the civil-service law all continuing positions which, because of the emergency, have been exempt from its operation.

The Ramspeck bill, shortly to be before the House of Representatives, legislatively empowers the President to fulfill that promise.

But that promise is no more forthright and—given an exchange of power—I take it, no more sure of fulfillment than is the Republican promise of the same year in its platform. It reads:

Under the New Deal, official authority has been given to inexperienced and incompetent persons. The civil service has been sacrificed to create a national political machine. As a result, the Federal Government has never presented such a picture of confusion and inefficiency. We pledge ourselves to the merit system, virtually destroyed by New Deal spoilsmen. It should be restored, improved, and extended. We will provide such conditions as offer an attractive, permanent career in Government service to young men and women of ability, irrespective of party affiliations.

You will note here the final confirmation of my presumption of full popularity for the civil service. It is cold in print but warm in promise. The parties compete with each other, not as to its merit but as to the speed of its enactment. What Mr. Farley has assured us could be done—

With time, patience, and hard work, I could construct a major political party in the United States without holding out a single job to deserving partisans.

this very thing both parties have assured us in their platforms should be done and would be done. They spur each other, sideways, only in their haste each to be the first to do it. Proud as I am of the promises, grateful as I am for a cause, I am made to reflect, nevertheless, by the joint sideways spurring, to reflect, I say, upon the competition of merit between the proverbial rooster and the legendary crow:

I sometimes think I'd rather crow  
And be a rooster than to roost  
And be a crow. But I dunno.

A rooster he can roost also,  
Which don't seem fair when crows can't crow.  
Which may help some. Still I dunno.

Crows should be glad of one thing though;  
Nobody thinks of eating crow,  
While roosters they are good enough  
For anyone unless they're tough.

There are lots of tough old roosters, though,  
And, anyway, a crow can't crow,  
So mebbe roosters stand more show;  
It looks that way. But I dunno.

The dubiety of the poem, my colleagues, applies only to the manners of the political parties, not to their devotion to merit. Their devotion culminates a demonstration satisfactory to me—and I hope to each of you—of the unanimity of us Representatives upon this very popular cause.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CAUSE AS REASON FOR ITS POPULARITY

Now, I ask myself, and I ask you: Why has this cause become so popular in the course of 57 years, starting below scratch, as it did, and proceeding through many, many scratches, as you know, from both sides? It is a singular incident in our national history that an unpopular cause in a short half century could come to be almost unanimously approved by the American people, as the Gallup poll suggests, and approved unanimously today by all loyal party members in the House of Representatives. Why is this? It is to this question, primarily, that I address myself in my remaining moments.

I would like to argue the question, if you will allow me a little elbow room and some intellectual leeway, from two points of view: From the point of view of the importance of civil service and then more earnestly and more lengthily from the point of view of the "unimportance" of civil service, so to say. I have a hunch, you see, that the primary business of a legislative body is not to concern itself with the enactment of things of first magnitude but with things of lesser degree. I intend to develop a distinction between the "important" and the "significant," if you will be good enough to follow me.

If I argued merely the importance of civil service, I would point in fashion prosaic to the efficiency and the economy of a scientific system of maintaining the administrative personnel of government as contrasted with the method of political pull before a victory and of political push after a defeat. The one method is relevant and logical; the other is irrelevant and adventitious to the job at hand. There is unquestionably a case to be made out upon the ground of importance from the point of view of economy, which is another popular watchword of the hour, and, from the point of view of efficiency, which is even more important for personal happiness. I content myself with arguing the importance of civil service only in an indirect, an historical manner.

When one looks at the history of these efforts on the part of a great and continuously expanding government to deal effectively with the problem of the proper personnel to carry on that government's permanent work, one will see that we have passed through three stages. The first was the stage represented by Thomas Jefferson's philosophy for equal participation of the two great parties in the selection of the administrative personnel of the Government. The second was Jackson's emphasis upon party monopoly. The third and last was Cleveland's insistence upon party neutrality. I ask you now to attend to these three in order. And first Jefferson's proposal with his reasons therefor:

If a due participation of office is a matter of right, how are vacancies to be obtained? Those by death are few; those by resignation none. Can any other mode than that of removal be proposed?

This is a painful office, but it is made my duty, and I meet it as such. It would have been to me a circumstance of great relief had I found a moderate participation of office in the hands of the majority—

That is, the newly elected Democrats, victorious for the first time—

I would then gladly have left to time and accident—

A euphemism for death—

to raise them to their just share. But their total exclusion calls for prompter corrections. I shall correct the procedure; but, that done, return with joy to the state of things, where the only questions concerning a candidate shall be, Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?

That was the view which Jefferson had, that the parties could be allowed to select the permanent administrative personnel, but that it had to be done on the grounds of equal participation of the parties as they oscillated in and out of power. That theory did not prevail, as we well know. So by the time of Andrew Jackson, though not wholly to be credited or blamed on Old Hickory, we had come to another view of the best way to select the people who work for the Government; that view was that it ought to be a matter of party monopoly.

Though Andrew Jackson declared that "the most disagreeable duty I have to perform is the removal and appointment to office," he nevertheless presented his philosophy justifying the painful job. Though his words sound to us like a sleepwalker talking anachronisms, they were sincere enough in him and portentous enough for the Federal service.

There are—

said Old Hickory—

perhaps few men who can for any length of time enjoy office and power without being more or less under the influence of feelings unfavorable to the faithful discharge of their public duties. Their integrity may be proof against improper considerations immediately addressed to themselves, but they are apt to acquire a habit of looking with indifference upon the public interests and of tolerating conduct from which an unpracticed man would revolt. Office is considered as a species of property, and government rather as a means of promoting individual interests than as an instrument created solely for the service of the people. \* \* \* The duties of all public offices are, or at least admit of being made, so plain and simple that men of intelligence may readily qualify themselves for their performance; and I cannot but believe that more is lost by the long continuance of men in office than is generally to be gained by their experience.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of party monopoly before the age of science and before the extension of the services of government to include every science and every art.

The third position is that illustrated by Grover Cleveland, who had found the job situation, cumulative from Jackson's day, so inimical to efficiency and economy in government that he enunciated the great principle of party neutrality with reference to the personnel problems of the Federal Government. "Public office is a public trust," this to our very day is our most moral public prescription. Fortunately for the Nation, it is Cleveland's policy, with some variation and some recession, which has been carried on down to our time. I take it that, in passing from Jefferson's plea for equal participation of the parties in choosing the personnel, through Jackson's view of party monopoly, to Cleveland's contention that parties ought to be neutral with reference to the administrative service of the Government, on down to our day when both great parties reaffirm their devotion to this principle in their published solemn pledge to the Nation, we have unanimously convinced ourselves that neither economy nor efficiency can be served save through party neutrality with reference to the permanent personnel of the Federal Government. That, my colleagues, is what the civil service is about. There may be some Rip van Winkles in the civil service asleep on the job, but they are not going to be awakened by political sleepwalkers who mumble against the principle of merit and keep walking in their sleep toward the Dark Ages of treating public jobs as private property for party or personal favorites.

Those who speak publicly and responsibly for the great parties speak in the light of our historic experience as to the utter importance and finality of merit in carrying on this vast

personnel enterprise in the Federal Government. So much for the importance of civil service for efficiency and economy.

Its overt importance, however, is not enough, I suspect, to explain the enormous popularity, which has drawn me to it as my cause.

#### A PHILOSOPHY OF THE UNIMPORTANT

From importance, then, let us turn now to unimportance, if you allow me this verbal leeway. I cannot but guess that the permanently significant does often transcend the pressingly important. If so, it pays us to keep clear a distinction between influence and power in reckoning up the tale of man's personal and collective life. I came to this view in a fashion so curious that I beg you to give me a moment to relate the story.

#### MY GRAND OLD MAN OF THE SEA

Worn out, like many other politicians, with my first campaign for public office over the entirety of a very great State, I was advised by my better nature to seek some recuperation in solitude and quietness, and that under a more beneficent sun than Illinois affords at every season. I found myself in the State of Arizona, far from civilization, and I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] when I say that. I see that he would like to say a further word for his great State. I do not yield, for I can say for him that it is indeed a great State that can still offer to citizens and visitors the priceless boon of solitude. I went where there was but one other man—but what a man he proved to be! I bless the day I discovered Arizona—and him.

He was the most curious combination of human characteristics I have ever seen rolled together in one mortal shape. That man became my "ancient mariner" of land as well as sea. He was, on the one side, an old sea captain, rough from the pages of the past when sailing vessels made maritime life still adventurous; but he was, on the other side, a complete composite of glorified landlubbers that I had known in the Texas of my childhood and of my youth. He was the embodiment of a singular, almost feminine, grace and elegance, but was also possessed of a temper mercurial and terrible as a cyclone. He was, my colleagues of the House, a picturesque combination and rare, a veritable Sampson of the Southwest. I shall not soon meet his like again. I can see him now, with my mind's eye, gentlemen, ripe in years and radiant in wisdom, there in the desert of Arizona recuperating from tuberculosis and living over again for my benefit the great experiences he had had, not only on every sea but in every land. But I lose myself in reverie, while my story tarries.

Learning that I had been recently elected to Congress, he offered to give me some advice. He said, "You will smile at this no doubt to begin with, but if you live to be as rich in experience and years as I am, you will no longer smile at the curious ways in which human influence works its way to power." Then he told me the story of a legislative experience which he himself had had in earlier life, a story, as you will see, which started me upon this train of thought. As I remember, he said it was in a certain "Principality of Excelsioriana." I did not identify the place on the map, I forgot to ask him where it was, and I may be mistaken about the name. But the logic of his experience there and the extraordinary clairvoyance of his advice to me will remain, I think, the high day of my whole life.

Warming over the coals of his own memory, he said: "You have noticed in the modern world that where fanatics like Hitler, or like Stalin's predecessor, Lenin, come to power and undertake through executive fiat, or even through legislative activity, to enforce upon a group matters admitted to be of final importance—national unity, let us say, or correct beliefs about religion, or even about economics—the very effort to legislate upon these finally important things has turned their importance to the poison of power in social life. 'Ah,' he said, 'I could have warned them long ago about communism and nazi-ism, because I came to see, through the strange wisdom of my friends in 'Excelsioriana,' that it is not the business of politics to concern itself, save by abstention, with things of the very first moment, but only with things of second- or third-rate importance.'"



I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of the great injustice I do that rare man's elegance in reporting his advice so bumblingly; but I must seek in my own humble way to convey to you the depth of his insight.

After a quiet period of musing, which the Arizona ozone facilitates, my patron continued: "I therefore not only give you the advice to seek popular causes, but I will tell you how you can find them. On the great issues that men concern themselves with of utter and pressing importance and moment, do not stick your neck out, because somebody is going to step on it." He said: "Go behind the pressing, or sit it out, to inquire into the principles of things and ask yourself, not what is important to be done directly by legislation but what is likely to get done two or three removes from the pressing through a proper sense of strategy. Do that and find a way from the empty pomp of power into the path that leads to human influence. In this way Fate works with you, and its little finger is more to be regarded than your own clenched fist."

That said, he pointed the moral of all his saying: "You know as well as I do that to maintain the dignity of the law, the proper respect for constituted authorities, and inner reverence for the genius of cooperation—that is the important thing. It is not this law or that which counts. It is whether you have a people law-abiding in their hearts, a people who reverence their traditions and adhere with pride to the unspoken and unwritten spirit of the group. These things of the last importance you know, as well as I, cannot be legislated."

"Yes," I said, "I know that, but I thought such matters belong to philosophers and poets, not to politicians." "No," he said, "it is the business of politicians, and I will show you how I worked it out in this Principality of Excelsioriana, betwixt at last the instructions of my friends there." Reflectively he continued: "I looked around for a long time for a matter that seemed not important on which I could legislate. I seized upon the matter of nudity," he went on, "not that I give a damn whether people wear clothes or go nude." At that, he gave his own bare body a resounding whack, as I moved beyond the reach of his mighty arm.

"No," said he, "nudity is not important. That is the reason I got a law passed against it. I was able to get the death penalty assessed against it. 'That's going pretty far,' I ventured. 'I was out,' countered he, 'to establish the majesty of law, not to hurt nudists. And do you know that only one of them dared his way to the gallows?' 'Poor fellow,' I sighed. 'Yes,' agreed he, 'but a small price to pay for the fear of God implanted, and, yes, for the love of the good which irradiated from that simple act of legislation.'"

"But," he said, "that was not my main stroke. It was important only for emboldening me to go the limit of the logic. I looked around for another and more important emphasis upon the unimportant as subject for significant legislation, and what I discovered finally was the weather. You'd think that there I'd hit many, too many, people, to remain popular. I got a law passed that made it illegal, with the penalty death, for anybody to say that it was colder than 40 degrees or that it was hotter than 70 degrees. We had to execute seven people, only seven, mark you, before they saw we were in earnest. Thereafter you'd have been amazed at the difference in spirit and, I may say, happiness of the people. In the first place, it took all the jokes away from that ancient and outworn subject of sex, and built them about the weather. Everybody vied with everybody else to see how close he could come to saying it, without saying it. Their 'information, please,' had a whole program built around the weather. A new theater arose and a wholly different and better 'Plutophone,' as he called the radio. 'It gave us,' he concluded, 'a new understanding of the deep motives of men and furnished a harmless way out past the censor of the subconscious.'"

I remember now how the old war horse's eye glistened, with the trace of a tear, as he told me in the desert of Arizona of the magnificent appeal he made before the packed galleries with all Members present the night his weather bill

was passed. His speech closed with a peroration like this, as I recall the lines:

What is it molds the life of man?  
The weather!  
What makes some black and others tan?  
The weather!  
What makes the Zulu live in trees?  
And Congo natives dress in leaves,  
While others go in furs and freeze?  
The weather! The weather!

#### UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES: A HINT TO THE SUFFICIENT MAY BE WISE

I confess, Mr. Speaker, though I can only suggest the rare character of this old man, that I take his wisdom as my personal watchword in politics. I mean presently to apply that wisdom, as best I may, to the popularity of the civil service, whose declared devotees both our great parties now are. But first, if I may hazard the application of an afterthought to—I do not say the Dies committee, but—the committee investigating un-American activities.

As I have confessed, I barely escaped risking my own precarious popularity on that cause. I still like, therefore, to linger over that danger escaped, and to consider how the danger might be mitigated for others. The committee's greatest danger lies, I suspect, in getting obsessed with the genuinely important things, with correct beliefs about religion or economics, and seeking legislatively to establish principles or to persecute persons. That, as my grand old man of the sea taught me, would prove fatal to the committee and possibly precarious to the Nation. If, however, the committee but continue the "unimportant" business of letting bray in public the asses who otherwise would not be heard beyond their own barnyards, it may serve at two or three removes the morale of our people. Already it has taught some silly citizens that thoughtful men and women require more reason for joining organizations than that they have no reason for not joining them. "Unimportant" as this result may appear, it seems to me a matter of the greatest "significance." It harbors in its womb the seeds of personal independence. The committee might indeed prove to be a homeopathic remedy for what the old captain and I agreed was the worst disease of our time, "Organizationitis." To start that cure a-working would be something, really.

#### APPLICATION OF MY ANCIENT MARINER'S WEIRD WISDOM TO CIVIL SERVICE

Returning now to civil service, let us connect its popularity with its "unimportance." And among the things in this sense "unimportant" I mention two. The first is sportsmanship. The second is skill.

#### SPORTSMANSHIP WITHOUT LEGISLATION

I want to indicate, first, that when we have put the whole of our Federal personnel under the civil service we shall have established a spirit of sportsmanship for the first time throughout American political life. I say sportsmanship, which we cannot legislate. I, for one, am aware, as a public officeholder, that I already have the advantage over any man that offers to run against me, because of the very office I do hold. I am ashamed as a sportsman, so far as I can control it, to have one vote influenced for me on the basis of patronage. It is not right, and it is not sportsmanship. [Applause.]

But, I repeat, we cannot legislate sportsmanship. We can, however, establish an example by forswearing any undue advantage which patronage gives us. Some creep toward this ideal down the criminal path marked by the Hatch bill, others take it the easy way of civic good manners. If we can approach this practice of sportsmanship by enacting civil service, under the guise of its being unimportant, we shall have passed from the mere preaching of fair play to the actual practice of sportsmanship in American political life. Upon this I should like to dilate at great length, but I may safely leave the rest I would say to your fertile imaginations.

#### SKILL WITHOUT LEGISLATION

The second of the unearned and indirect fruits that have great significance but concrete unimportance is reverence for skill. We politicians need to have our people understand that politics is in itself a work of extraordinary skill. I

want to do my part to remove from the mantle of the practicing politicians the aroma of skulduggery. Most of us know that most imputations against the politician are not true. We know that he is skilled, and we know that a nation's efficiency and its morale, and therefore its happiness, are always determined by the practice of skill and respect for that practice.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend for a moment?

Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois will be allowed to complete his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, gentlemen.

I have a fancy of my own that as over against the technological and industrial skills of mind and muscle in our day, the skill which constitutes a man a good politician is of such superior significance that if it were once understood that not just anybody can be a good politician, but that it takes an extraordinary person, with an unusual bent of mind, with an unusual soft heart and an unusual thick skin, to be a politician, then we would have established, not only our right to become what we are—the secular saints of this scientific society, spreading the cement of sociality in the thousands of crevices rent in our social fabric by the division of labor and the specialization of these technological skills—but if once we could establish that it is the business of the politician to be practitioner in general of the art of interpretation across all human cleavages, we should have established a fact of revolutionary reach and influence.

The art of conversation is everywhere admitted to be almost a dead art. The art of "radiatority" has hardly yet been born. The art of public address is confined to so small a section of the natural aristocracy of the human tongue that it is pathetic how few men and how few women in our society can really grace the use publicly of our noble language and can tie together in one seamless web the glistening insights of the majestic mind and the flowing motions of human sentiments.

Now, that is what we politicians are mostly good at, and it is a gift that is so near like that of the gods that if we could ever turn ourselves loose to learn how to practice that magnificent gift, instead of being distracted by the wretched business of patronage, at which we are not any good for the Nation, we might then come to develop once more a parliament of Websters and Calhouns and Douglasses and, in an age that despises the spirit of oratory, grace once more the noblest of the human arts, the art of oral and elegant expression. But what chance has a politician to learn to do this job superbly? To put it simply, what chance has a man to know enough about many subjects, even one subject, to be able to make magnificent and moving statements of inner meaning, of complex and interlaced problems, when nine-tenths of his time is given up to the practice of the civic turpitude of political partisanship in affairs administrative? What chance have we got to be more than mediocre in the practice of the great skill of moving eloquence? I do not, I may say, voice here a personal complaint, since my job as Congressman at Large carries no patronage.

There is not a man and there is not a woman here who does not know how pathetic we all feel in having to move through faux pas of ignorance to faux pas of ignorance because we have not any time here to master our problems. We have not any time here or at home to master the intricacies of even the bills, not to mention the achievement of clairvoyance with the inner genius of this great Republic. We have no time systematically to read its history. We must neglect its poets, gulp at its novelists, and overlook its philosophers. Yet in these artists, more even than in our scientists, is brewed the very spirit of our national life. Give ourselves the chance once to practice the skill which we profess, and we shall not only have redeemed our profession from the imputation of jobbing skulduggery but we shall have set in motion—and mark this, for this is the main point—we shall have set in motion, through our example, a restoration of pride in every

form of skill that goes to make this the great industrial Nation that it is.

The one complaint against my country which I allow myself, as a patriot, while I go up and down this land constantly, arises from the growing realization that this reputedly efficient Nation is losing its joy in the job, the humble jobs that men and women are doing. The ancient instinct of workmanship is on the decline throughout the whole of this industrial Republic, and the best we can do about it lies beyond the power of legislation. No more than we can legislate sportsmanship can we legislate skill; but if we would practice the consummate political skill of accommodation and compromise through the spoken word, we should have set in operation throughout this Republic, in the words of my old sea captain, "influences that would become tidal waves of civic restoration." A full and complete civil service would free not only us from job-brokerage but free also a thousand special skills from our blundering political interference. I cannot go further into this line of thought, thus imposing upon your graciousness in allowing me generous extension of time.

#### A LITTLE STATE LEGISLATOR MAY LEAD US

I am pleased to have here in my hand a document that makes it unnecessary for me to extend myself further upon that subject. It is a statement by a State legislator who has given me permission to use it, but who, modestly for a State politician, asks me not to reveal his name. It is taken from a speech which he himself, apparently, made.

Gentlemen, let me not close this sober defense of freedom of speech upon a somber note. It is in defense of the joy of life that I live and talk. Better an hour of freedom than a day of caution, than a year of fear, than a life of suppression. Talk is a form of freedom too cheap to make dear by prohibition. How dear, indeed, this freedom is to have which is so cheap to allow. Yet talk so telling in the tale to the teller is mostly nonsense to any outside listener. Consider now how few nuggets you carry with you from all the Pullman, poolroom, and parlor talk you have ever heard. Consider, too, how few violent deeds you can recall as flowing from all the bold, bad talk you have ever heard. The fruit in action of even the tallest talk is mostly but more talk.

This thought might warn us against taking talk too seriously and thus leave us free to commit it more joyously. The Communist may talk loud and long of his perfect order—of the classless society which he professes to see in the crystal ball of dialectical materialism—and even talk of the necessity of helping the crystal ball to bring to birth its blood and thunder. Let him talk! Let him talk! He's as little likely to perpetrate his secular perfection of Saturday night as we our sacred perfection of Sunday morning. The reason is the same in each case—perfection is to preach, not to practice.

Nevertheless, half the fun of life is in flowing freely at the mouth. It may be but a bubble at the tea table, rising to a bubble before the liquored bar, and striding to a bickering before the enrobed bench. It may be the whispered retinue of sweet nothings—all-important, it is said, in the high art of making love. It may rise to a nobler gushing from the rostrum and the stump. It may become an avalanche of foam and fury in the presence of hardly suffered wrong. In whatever form the flowing flows the heart is eased of fullness so that it may enjoy itself to fullness once again and back again.

Nobody knows the supreme worthfulness of this wordy pleasure more than we politicians. We get elected on the verbal easement of oratory. We swell the flood of wind and word during our terms of talk. And we pass, when we pass we must, upon the gentler receding flow of elegiac whisperings "too full for sound or foam." While we live and dignify the larynx, legislation is the heroic by-product of our profession. Half the rewards of all our silent days arise from talk projected or from talk remembered. In nothing are we more representative of our people than in the chronic taste for talk. Of our people? Not merely. It is written down in sacred sound that "in the beginning was the word." As in the beginning so in the ending and in the middle. The word remains and abides.

Newspapers are but talk still sticky with ink; magazines talk where the ink has dried; books talk canned in decorous code and preserved against hours of solitude and silence. Our meditative musing is but free-wheeling talk, and our most cogent thinking, talk rehearsed in private against the happy hour when the stage will once more be ours. Talk is full telltale of our simian ancestry, chattering among the trees; talk is full commemorative of our human heritage, sharing sense through sound; talk is faintly predictive of our fairest clairvoyance, in some romance grounded after gloaming of perfect understanding. Meantime they live fullest who talk best. And as for service we also serve who only stand and talk.

Off with the brakes! On with the fest! Let talk grow more and more refined!

After that paean of praise for our political art, I say no more. Only this I ask you to let me do, and it in reverence



for my mentor, the old sea captain, who awakened me to life and wisdom—let me close my first appeal to you as he closed his last and greatest appeal to his parliament, with a fitting poem. Allow me this conceit, and I will take off my hat in public to the day-by-day eloquence of this honorable body. For, colleagues in laryngeal liquidity—

I eat and drink your precious words,  
My spirit grows robust.  
I know no more that I am poor  
Or that my frame is dust.  
I dance along the glad days,  
And my bequest of wings is but your talk,  
What liberty a loosened tongue may bring!

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may extend the remarks he made today and include certain quotations from the hearings on the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### VERMONT

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had a little word that I intended to say about the State of Vermont. I decided not to say it at all, but merely received permission to extend my remarks and inserted it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was just a few words about the State of Vermont, which I thought were complimentary to that State, even if I did not entirely agree with the national policy of Vermont as was revealed in the few remarks.

I rise today—and, by the way, it is a good time to do it, since I am filled with the delight and charm of the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] who just preceded me. I would have been a poor man, indeed, had I not heard that diverting and charming address, and it will always be a cherished hour that kept me here today.

But I want to say of Vermont that I am sure that delightful State, so rich in the history of this Nation, sending as it does to this body a man that I think is the composite of Vermonters—if there is a statesman, a kindly, pleasant, and delightful gentleman on this floor, it is he. He is not here just now, so I am not trying to merely compliment one who is immediately present. If there is anything there that makes an offending sound in the ears of any Vermonter, or certainly that may seem ill-natured to that statesman and charming gentleman, I am sorry indeed. But in those remarks I spoke of the people of Vermont as the kind of people we refer to as the salt of the earth. I was very seriously sincere when I made those remarks. All I want to say is that it was entirely in the spirit of good humor and good will. The only reference I made was concerning the national policy.

I have a number of letters and editorials revealing that they have compared Vermont with Alabama—Alabama is my home State, you know.

I was not discussing Alabama, however; neither was I discussing State matters; I was discussing national matters. So I have taken this time today to declare against any intent of offense.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I am interested in one other important matter that has shown itself, and I hope we can work out some way in which to take action on it; if we can, we should.

The gentleman at the head of the C. I. O., Mr. John Lewis, is in the news again, as many of you have noticed. Since he first took the Vice President from the prospective Presidential list and doomed him, he has attacked the eminent administrator, the ex-Governor of Indiana and so forth, the Honorable Paul McNutt, and doomed him, and has now doomed the President of the United States. I wonder what we can do about

our comrade and friend, our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]? He is in distress—and this other gentleman, Chief Big Thunder No Rain—he is in the same category, and there may be a few others also. They have been belaboring us Democrats constantly about Mr. Lewis, but I think in view of what has now happened to them, indeed a catastrophe, we, as a body, ought to get together and see if we can do something, especially for these two gentlemen; something to relieve the pain and suffering they are undergoing at this time; if we could have a caucus—something that has never been done in this body—a caucus of Democrats and Republicans; if we may all get together and have such a caucus to help these poor boys we should do so, because their only harp is broken and their one chord is lost; the cold winds are blowing right through their clothes today, and they are in sore and dire distress. They are desolate and marooned on the island of despair. If we can, for once, clasp hands and do something to save them we shall have done something that is sorely needed at this moment. For some time it has been the only string to their bow, and now, alas, it has broken. I thank you. [Applause and laughter.]

#### BIRTHDAY CAKE PRESENTED TO PRESIDENT BY THE BAKERY AND CONFECTIONERY WORKERS' UNION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the celebration of the President's birthday and the campaign in behalf of those suffering from infantile paralysis, the labor division of the committee for the celebration of the President's birthday, under the direction of Mr. William Green as chairman and Mr. Gilbert E. Hyde as executive secretary, brought to Washington three charming young ladies who are now sitting in the Gallery of this House, to present to the President a beautiful birthday cake made by the Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union, and also to present to the President for the use of this foundation money contributed by union officials.

In the extension of my remarks I shall put in a history of this cake and the part these young ladies played in presenting it to the President of the United States at the White House today.

The matter referred to follows:

The Misses Elnore Myrup, Marilou Winter, and Elsie Schmidt are three Chicago girls, the daughters of the three leading officials of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union, which made the huge birthday cake to be presented to President Roosevelt today in commemoration of his fifty-eighth birthday, January 30.

The cake was donated to the labor division of the committee for the celebration of the President's Birthday by the Bakery Union as a means of raising additional funds for the "Fight Infantile Paralysis" campaign. A. F. of L. unions bought the 58 candles on the cake, which grossed more than \$5,800 for the paralysis fund.

The labor division, of which William Green is chairman and Chester M. Wright director of organization, distributed close to three and one-half million President's birthday greeting cards to members of organized labor throughout the Nation and its Territories, and asked each member receiving a card to return it to the White House loaded with dimes and dollars for the war on the dreaded scourge.

Yesterday evening the cake itself was placed on exhibition at a large reception at the Mayflower in honor of the three young ladies who flew here to present President Roosevelt with the cake.

While in the city, the girls are the guests of the labor division and will be dinner guests of William Green as well as the Washington local of the Bakery Union, whose national affairs are directed by their fathers.

[Applause.]

#### PATRONAGE AND STATESMANSHIP

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, inspired by the intellectual and intriguing discussion by our colleague from Illinois [Mr. SMITH], and stimulated by the wit of the inimitable gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], I am driven to make a public confession here this afternoon.

I must admit that up until today I did not know why it was that as a new Member I discovered that the statesmanship on the Republican side of the aisle was so much greater than I found it to be on the other side of the aisle. Today that has been driven home to me, and I see that it is because my Republican colleagues are not troubled by patronage problems of any kind but can dedicate themselves to the tasks of true statesmanship. I realize now that it is because of the complete freedom on our Republican side from all problems of patronage that we can and do proceed without partisanship, patronage, or pelf to the study of the facts at hand and to the summation of conclusions which are so logical that they frequently entice the support of the able and patriotic gentleman from Illinois. He is a man of great ability and persuasive eloquence. I therefore invite the cooperation of my Democratic colleague from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] in helping us Republicans in our efforts to unseat the New Deal in the coming election so that he and his political associates may share with us in having that freedom from problems of political patronage which he has so effectively shown to be the cause of so much suffering on the part of Members on his side of the aisle. It really does not seem fair to deny you Democrats any longer the blessings of ample opportunity to study the facts as they are presented and to engage in the great art of the spoken word in true statesmanlike style. Verily, you have earned the right to be freed for a time of all problems of patronage. I think the country, as a whole, is mindful of that fact.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would remind the gentleman that there is a much more direct way of accomplishing the same purpose, namely, by supporting the bill H. R. 960, which the gentleman from Georgia has introduced, and which I hope will be before us soon.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Does not the gentleman believe, in keeping with his desire and his sentiment, that it would be much easier to hold the present party in power until that is cleared up—until all that is taken care of—that matter which is such a problem in the life of the minority party? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. I presume in that statement the gentleman from Alabama refers to the Democratic Party which has been traditionally, and now seems soon to again become, the minority party of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Does not the gentleman realize that if H. R. 960 is passed a great many of these people would be blanketed in without benefit of a real civil-service examination? That it would be no test of merit or efficiency?

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is true. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] would object to having people blanketed in the civil service in that manner, because I know he is sincere in his desire to improve the public service, as are both you and I.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sure he is. I know he would like open competitive examinations. His altogether delightful speech proved that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The record of the Republican Party shows thousands of similar cases where employees appointed politically were blanketed in without even the benefit of a noncompetitive examination.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman will agree with me that a very small number, comparatively, was blanketed in under the Republican administration. In this case approximately 300,000, I believe, will be blanketed in. There is a great difference. However, that does not excuse the Republican Party, and I hold no brief in behalf of either the Republican or Democratic Party for blanketing in people into the civil service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 419. Joint resolution to extend for 3 additional months the time during which articles imported free of duty for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition or the New York World's Fair may be sold or abandoned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The Committee on Roads will continue public hearings in the Roads Committee room, 1011, New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Friday, January 26, 1940, on H. R. 7891, a bill to assist the States in the improvement of highways.

##### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a hearing Monday, January 29, 1940, at 10 a. m., before the Committee on Naval Affairs on H. R. 8026, to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

##### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Tuesday, January 30, 1940:

The following hearing was at first scheduled for Friday, January 5, but was later postponed until Thursday, January 25, 1940. Now it has been postponed again, this time being Tuesday, January 30, 1940, at 10 a. m.

H. R. 7357, to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 465), to provide for the safe carriage of explosives or other dangerous or semidangerous articles or substances on board vessels; to make more effective the provisions of the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1929, relating to the carriage of dangerous goods; and for other purposes.

Tuesday, February 6, 1940:

H. R. 7527, to make effective the provisions of the Minimum Age (sea) Convention (revised), 1936, and for other purposes.

Hearings will be continued Wednesday, February 7, 1940, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6130, to provide for mandatory or compulsory inspection and permissive or voluntary grading of fish, fishery products, fishery byproducts, shellfish, crustacea, seaweeds, and all other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life, and the products and byproducts thereof, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, February 13, 1940:

H. R. 1780, to amend section 7 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. III, title 46, sec. 319), relative to penalties on certain undocumented vessels and cargoes engaging in the coastwise trade or the fisheries, and for other purposes.



H. R. 5837, to amend section 221 of the Shipping Act, barring certain aliens from participating in the benefits thereof.  
 H. R. 6770, to amend Revised Statutes 4311 (U. S. C. 251).  
 H. R. 7694, to amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Tuesday, February 20, 1940:

H. R. 4079, to amend sections 4353 and 4355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

H. R. 6751, to repeal certain laws with respect to manifests and vessel permits.

H. R. 5788, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collector of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

H. R. 5789, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collectors of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

Friday, February 23, 1940:

H. R. 7639, to provide for the examination of civilian nautical schools and for the inspection of vessels used in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

There will be a hearing Tuesday, January 30, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 430, and House Joint Resolution 436, for the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Poland, and for other purposes.

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, January 31, 1940, at 10:30 a. m. In re 7110 (LESINSKI), naturalization of certain natives of India.

#### COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold public hearings in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, at 10 a. m., on the following dates on the matters named:

##### DEPENDENTS OF REGULAR ESTABLISHMENT VETERANS

Friday, January 26, 1940:

H. R. 7191. A bill to make more equitable provision for pensions for the dependents of deceased veterans of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard.

H. R. 7522. A bill to equalize the pensions payable to the dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment with those payable to dependents of veterans of the World War whose death is due to service.

H. R. 7652. A bill to grant pensions and increase of pensions to widows and dependents of certain deceased members or former members of the military or naval service.

H. R. 7734. A bill to equalize the pensions payable to the dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment with those payable to the dependents of veterans of the World War whose death is due to service.

##### MEDAL OF HONOR PENSIONS

Thursday, February 1, 1940:

H. R. 3385. A bill to liberalize the provisions of the Medal of Honor Roll Act of April 27, 1916.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday, January 26, 1940, on H. R. 6652, to aid consumers by setting up standards of quality based on performance as a guide in the purchase of consumer goods.

Hearings will begin Monday, February 5, 1940, at 10 a. m., before the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. State regulatory bodies will be heard first.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Monday, January 29, 1940, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bills (H. R. 7528 and S. 1935) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout

the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (sec. 75). The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

On Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 8016) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (municipal compositions). The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1300. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 11, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination with a view to determining what remedial action is necessary and justified to permit unobstructed discharge into the Missouri River of flood waters from the Indian Creek flood channel at Council Bluffs, Iowa, requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted February 9, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1301. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 11, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Port Alexander, Alaska, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted September 26, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1302. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 11, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Elfin Cove, Alaska, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 579); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1303. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 11, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on reexamination of Delaware River between Philadelphia and the sea, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 8, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 580); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1304. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a bill to amend section 3 of title 43 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1305. A letter from the Secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 368. Resolution to authorize the payment of expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 321 (Rept. No. 1530). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7339. A bill to exempt sail vessels from the provisions of section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended, requiring the manning of certain merchant vessels by able seamen, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7420. A bill to amend laws for preventing collisions of vessels; with amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8083. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certain markers for certain graves; without amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 8148. A bill to provide that Federal grants for old-age assistance shall match State contributions 4 for 1 as to payments up to \$30, and equal State contributions as to additional payments not in excess of \$40; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 8149. A bill to provide for a more equitable sugar quota for the mainland sugarcane area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 8150. A bill providing for the barring of claims against the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 8151. A bill to provide travel expenses of civilian officers and employees upon official change of station; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 8152. A bill providing for procurements without advertising; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 8153. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8154. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1940, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. R. 8155. A bill providing for the issuance of patents to town lots in Harding town site, Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI (by request):

H. R. 8156. A bill to equalize the pensions payable to the dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment with those payable to the dependents of veterans of the World War whose deaths are due to service-connected disabilities or who, at time of death, were suffering with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 8157. A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 8158. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Emory River and tributaries, Tennessee, with a view to the control of floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8159. A bill for the relief of the Shaver Forwarding Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 8160. A bill for the relief of the Ringle Development Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 8161. A bill granting an increase of pension to Annie McClean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 8162. A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 8163. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sabatini; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 8164. A bill for the relief of Wilson N. Yost; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 8165. A bill granting a pension to Alfred Hacker and Belle Hacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 8166. A bill for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 8167. A bill granting a pension to Walter J. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 8168. A bill for the relief of Luther M. Kelley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution for the relief of South Dakota Wheat Growers Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6258. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Firemen, Oilers, Coal Passers, Helpers, and Operators, Boston, Mass., opposing the continuation of the reciprocal-trade pacts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6259. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of J. C. O'Donnell and 55 other citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., urging the enactment of the Patman chain store tax bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6260. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of E. Thayer Ward, of Wichita, Kans., and 11 others, urging enactment of the Patman chain store tax bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6261. By Mr. JACOBSEN: Resolution of the Eastern Iowa Veterinary Association, Inc., recommending that protective barriers be administered against the importation of infectious livestock diseases in the United States by the United States Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6262. Also, resolution of the Quad-City Theatre Managers Association, petitioning their representatives in Congress to vote against the Neely antiblock booking bill and to do their utmost in defeating it; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6263. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of 18 owners and managers of 18 theaters in Rock Island County, Ill., opposing the Neely bill (S. 280); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6264. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Albany Port District Commission, Albany, N. Y., expressing commendation upon the submission to the House of Representatives of House Resolution 360, which provides for an investigation to determine the advisability of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Deep Waterway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6265. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the State of New York Banking Department, New York City, concerning further chartering of Federal savings and loan associations and power



to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6266. Also, petition of the Social Democratic Federation of New York City, concerning the passage of the Wagner-Steagall housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6267. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 25 residents of Chester County, Pa., to expand the Federal relief and employment program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6268. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Wenatchee Rotary Club, adopted at its regular session at Wenatchee on January 4, 1940, opposing the setting aside of any further area in the State of Washington for national-park purposes, pointing out that it would seriously handicap the further development of industry, mining, lumbering, and potential water-power resources of this region and would further increase unemployment and add greater burdens of relief and taxation on the people; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6269. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Garden Grove, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6270. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Private Chauffeurs Union, Local 800, New York City, endorsing the program of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and Vicinity to restore the prevailing wage on all Government projects; to the Committee on Labor.

6271. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of W. A. Ensign and 22 other citizens of Clay Center and Manhattan, Kans., in behalf of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6272. Also, petition of Milton Parks Belcher, of Eureka, Kans., and 180 other citizens of the Fourth District of Kansas, in behalf of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6273. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the City Council of Chicago, Ill., expressing its approval of the present reciprocal-trade policy of our Government and favoring the continuance thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6274. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the United Sugar Refinery Workers Local Industrial Union, No. 151, of Edgewater, N. J., requesting that Congress make a provision to exclude the importation of refined sugar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6275. Also, petition of the Women's State Republican Club of New Jersey, Inc., opposing the Wagner health bill (S. 1620); to the Committee on Labor.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1940

The Chaplain, Rev. ZēBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, the ever living One, who alone abidest, in whom is all our life: Make us glad in the confidence that we are Thine, that in Thy loving care we may keep ourselves in all truth and purity, plastic to the touch of Thy gently shaping hand. As the laughter of evil or the song of victory leaves lingering echoes in the house of life, enable us to realize that in the little things, which we are so apt to overlook, we are preparing tears and shame or beauty and love in the lives of others, so great is the unforeseen might of our most trivial deed and thought. Help us, therefore, day by day to cultivate habits of goodness, established by the constant inspiration of Christlike thoughts in us, that we may never miss life's great things which do not strive or cry as they draw near, but move in gentleness and quiet calm, as they reveal in the soul's great moments the wondrous purpose of Thy will. In our dear Saviour's name we ask it. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 25, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8068. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8068. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### CANCELATION OF CERTAIN CHARGES AGAINST INDIANS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of an order for the cancellation of certain charges in connection with reimbursable charges of the Government existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

### AMENDMENT OF RETIREMENT ACTS—CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and other retirement acts, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate petitions of the Maybury Alumni Association and sundry citizens, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to exempt handicapped persons, such as arrested tuberculosis workers, on W. P. A. projects from the operation of the lay-off provision after 18 months of such work, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Local No. 114, Alkaline Salt Workers, of Trona, Calif., praying for the continuance of the so-called La Follette Civil Liberties Committee, investigating the question of civil rights and the rights of labor, and expressing appreciation for the work of the committee, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Social Democratic Federation of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Steagall housing bill, providing for the issuance of additional U. S. H. A. bonds in the amount of \$800,000,000, etc., so as to provide better housing conditions, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Laymen's League of the Church of Our Father (Unitarian-Universalist), Detroit, Mich., favoring all possible material assistance, short of war, to the Republic of Finland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the appointment of Myron C. Taylor as representative at the Vatican and requesting the recall of Mr. Taylor, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.